

# CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY Weekly Report

REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED IN WHOLE OR IN PART

VOL. XVIII  
PAGES 1625-1653

**No. 40**

WEEK ENDING SEPT. 30, 1960

## CONTENTS

	Page
What's Ahead	ii
Around The Capitol	1634
Political Notes	1645
Week In Congress	iv

## Conservative Coalition

**GOP, Southern Coalition  
Won 58% of Test Votes**

Page 1625-33

	Page
<i>Presidential Campaign</i> . . . . .	1645
<i>Southern Governors' Conference</i> . .	1636
<i>Civil Defense Report</i> . . . . .	1643

## 2nd Session Report

### HOW LOBBIES FARED

Page 1637-42

COPYRIGHT 1960

BY CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY INCORPORATED

*The Authoritative Reference on Congress*

1156 NINETEENTH STREET, N.W. • WASHINGTON 6, D.C. • FEderal 8-4660



# What's Ahead?

*Dates are listed as released by sources and are sometimes subject to change.*

## Committee Hearings

- Oct. 11 -- DR. LINUS PAULING, naming of petitioners in 1957 to ban nuclear testing, Senate Judiciary, Internal Security Subc.

## Political Events

- Oct. 1 -- HAWAII CONGRESSIONAL PRIMARY.  
Oct. 7 -- TELEVISION DEBATE. Presidential nominees John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon will appear on news panel discussion.  
Oct. 13 -- TELEVISION DEBATE. Presidential nominees John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon will appear on news panel discussion.  
Oct. 21 -- TELEVISION DEBATE. Presidential nominees John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon will discuss foreign policy.  
Nov. 8 -- ELECTION DAY.

## Other Events

- Oct. 2-4 -- INTERSTATE CIRCULATION MANAGERS ASSN., convention, Benjamin Franklin Hotel, Philadelphia.  
Oct. 2-7 -- INTERNATIONAL RAILWAY PATROLMEN'S UNION (AFL-CIO), Hamilton Hotel, Chicago.  
Oct. 3-7 -- NATIONAL MARITIME UNION (AFL-CIO), Manhattan Center, New York.  
Oct. 3-7 -- UNITED TEXTILE WORKERS OF AMERICA (AFL-CIO), convention, New Yorker Hotel, New York.  
Oct. 4-17 -- KING FREDERICK AND QUEEN INGRID OF DENMARK, visit to United States.  
Oct. 5-8 -- NATIONAL ASSN. OF PHOTO-LITHOGRAPHERS, 28th ANNUAL CONVENTION, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago.  
Oct. 9-12 -- AMERICAN PETROLEUM CREDIT ASSN., 36th annual conference, Park-Sheraton Hotel, New York.  
Oct. 9-13 -- DIRECT MAIL ADVERTISING ASSN., 43rd convention, Americana Hotel, Miami Beach.  
Oct. 10-12 -- AMERICAN GAS ASSN., annual convention, Atlantic City.  
Oct. 10-14 -- INDUSTRIAL UNION MARINE AND SHIP-BUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA (AFL-CIO), convention, Edison Hotel, New York.  
Oct. 13-14 -- WORLD NEWSPAPER FORUM, Los Angeles.  
Oct. 13-14 -- ADVERTISING MEDIA CREDIT EXECUTIVES ASSN., convention, Sheraton Towers Hotel, Chicago.

- Oct. 13-15 -- UTILITY WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA (AFL-CIO), convention, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington.  
Oct. 15-23 -- NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS, 43rd national automobile show, Cobo Hall, Detroit.  
Oct. 17-20 -- AMERICAN LEGION, annual convention, Fontainebleau Hotel, Miami Beach. Vice President Richard M. Nixon and Sen. John F. Kennedy will speak Oct. 19-20.  
Oct. 17-21 -- NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL, annual meeting, Chicago.  
Oct. 17-22 -- UNITED CEMENT, LIME AND GYPSUM WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION (AFL-CIO), convention, Adolphus Hotel, Dallas.  
Oct. 19-21 -- AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSN., annual accounting and finance workshop, Hotel Russel Erskine, Huntsville, Ala.  
Oct. 19-21 -- NATIONAL PICKLE PACKERS ASSN., annual meeting, Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago.  
Oct. 21-22 -- AMERICAN RAILWAY SUPERVISORS ASSN. (AFL-CIO), convention, LaSalle Hotel, Chicago.  
Oct. 22-23 -- NATIONAL EXECUTIVE MARKETING CONFERENCE, Roosevelt and Monteleone Hotels, New Orleans.  
Oct. 23-25 -- INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSN. OF AMERICA, annual meeting, Statler Hilton Hotel, Dallas.  
Oct. 23-26 -- NORTH AMERICAN GASOLINE TAX CONFERENCE, LaSalle Hotel, Chicago.  
Oct. 24-26 -- GROCERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA INC., annual meeting, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York.  
Oct. 24-27 -- INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY, symposium on chemical effects of nuclear transformations, Prague, Czechoslovakia.  
Oct. 24-27 -- INSTITUTE OF SANITATION MANAGEMENT, annual conference and show, Sheraton-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit.  
Oct. 24-28 -- INTERNATIONAL ASSN. OF BRIDGE AND STRUCTURAL IRON WORKERS (AFL-CIO), convention, Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington.  
Oct. 25 -- MALAYAN PRIME MINISTER TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA, visit to United States.  
Oct. 26-28 -- NATIONAL ASSN. OF MOTOR BUS OWNERS INC., convention, Boca Raton Hotel, Boca Raton, Fla.  
Nov. 14-16 -- AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE, 40th annual meeting, Conrad Hilton, Palmer House, and Congress Hotels, Chicago.  
Nov. 14-16 -- 47th NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE CONVENTION, National Foreign Trade Council, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York.

Editor and President: Henrietta and Nelson Poynter.

Executive Editor: Thomas N. Schroth.

Senior Writers: Elizabeth J. Brenner, Robert C. Keith, William A. Korn, Helene C. Monberg, Neal R. Peirce, Spencer A. Rich.

Research Writers: Stephen Chatrnick, Ruth Hussey, Judy Kazan, Gladys Miller, Jonas V. Morris, James Saylor, Shirley Seib, Wayne Walker, Edward T. Walsh.

C. Q. Almanac Editor: Georgianna F. Rathbun.

Editorial Assistants: Ron Bitondo, Carol Gregory.

Publisher: Buel F. Weare.

Business Manager: Walter E. Thomas.

Production Supervisor: Walter W. Conklin, Jr.

Copyright 1960 by Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1156 Nineteenth St. N.W., Washington 6, D.C. All reproduction rights, including quotation, broadcasting and publication are reserved for current editorial clients. Second rights are reserved, including use of Congressional Quarterly material in campaign supplements, advertisements and handbooks without special permission. Rates are based on membership and/or circulation of clients and will be furnished on request. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

**'CONSERVATIVE COALITION' APPEARED IN 22% OF ROLL CALLS**

The "conservative coalition" of Republicans and Southern Democrats demonstrated its continued potency during the 1960 sessions of the Senate and the House of Representatives. (For definitions, see box)

**Number of Coalition Votes**

The conservative coalition appeared on 65, or 22 percent, of the 1960 session's 300 roll calls. (For coalition votes see p. 1628-30.) The coalition appeared on 17 percent of the 1959 roll calls and 18 percent of the 1958 roll calls. The number of coalition roll calls for 1960, however, was inflated by a series of 10 House roll calls on a single measure, the Area Redevelopment Act.

The results for the last three years:

	Total Roll Calls	Coalition Roll Calls	Percentage of Coalition Roll Calls
<b>1960</b>			
Both chambers	300	65	22%
Senate	207	46	22
House	93	19	20
<b>1959</b>			
Both Chambers	302	51	17
Senate	215	40	19
House	87	11	13
<b>1958</b>			
Both Chambers	293	52	18
Senate	200	38	19
House	93	14	15

**Victories and Defeats**

The 1958 election had cut into the coalition's potential strength in Congress. In 1957 and 1958, Southern Democrats and Republicans held 311 of the 435 House seats and 71 of the 96 Senate seats. During most of the 86th Congress (with slight variations because of deaths, resignations and special elections) Southern Democrats and Republicans held 59 of the 100 Senate seats and 261 of the 437 House seats.

The percentage of coalition victories in coalition roll calls in the Senate remained relatively steady between 1959 and 1960 (from 65 percent in 1959 to 67 percent in 1960). These figures were substantially lower than the percentage of Senate coalition victories in past years: 86 percent in 1958 and 100 percent in 1957.

In the House, the percentage of coalition victories dropped sharply from 91 percent in 1959 to 35 percent in

**Definitions**

● **CONSERVATIVE COALITION** -- As used in this study, the term "conservative coalition" means a voting alliance of Republicans and Southern Democrats against the Northern Democrats in Congress. This meaning, rather than any philosophic definition of the "conservative" position, provides the basis for CQ's selection of coalition roll calls.

● **CONSERVATIVE COALITION ROLL CALL** -- Any roll call on which the majority of voting Southern Democrats and the majority of voting Republicans oppose the stand taken by the majority of voting Northern Democrats. Roll calls on which there is an even division within the ranks of voting Northern Democrats, Southern Democrats or Republicans are not included.

● The Southern states are Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia. The other 37 states are grouped as the North in this study.

● **CONSERVATIVE COALITION SUPPORT SCORE** -- Percentage of conservative coalition roll calls on which a Member votes "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote, even if a Member announces his stand, lower his score.

● **CONSERVATIVE COALITION OPPOSITION SCORE** -- Percentage of conservative coalition roll calls on which a Member votes "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Support and Opposition scores add to 100 percent only if a Member votes on all coalition roll calls.

1960. A major reason for the drop, however, was the large number of votes on the Area Redevelopment Act, a measure which appealed to many normal coalition supporters because of its offer of federal funds to aid their districts. The coalition was defeated 10 times in a series of 10 votes during parliamentary maneuvering on the Area Redevelopment Act. Of the other 9 coalition votes during the year, the coalition won 7, or 78 percent. The coalition's percentage of success in the House has dropped in the last two election years. The pattern runs: 1957, 81 percent success; 1958, 64 percent success; 1959, 91 percent success; 1960, 35 percent success (or 78 percent, excluding Area Redevelopment votes).

The coalition's won-lost record from 1957 through 1960 is shown in these tables:

	Coalition Roll Calls	Coalition Victories	Percentage Of Victories
<b>1960</b>			
Both Chambers	65	38	58%
Senate	46	31	67
House	19	7	35
<b>1959</b>			
Both Chambers	51	36	71
Senate	40	26	65
House	11	10	91
<b>1958</b>			
Both Chambers	52	41	79
Senate	38	32	86
House	14	9	64
<b>1957</b>			
Both Chambers	28	25	89
Senate	12	12	100
House	16	13	81

### Coalition Scores

CQ prepared Coalition Support and Coalition Opposition scores for each Member of Congress on the basis of the coalition votes. The scores measure the percentage of times each Member voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement and in disagreement with the position taken by the conservative coalition.

#### Composite Scores

The Coalition Support and Coalition Opposition scores below are a composite of the individual scores of Southern Democrats (SD), Republicans (GOP) and Northern Democrats (ND).

1960			86th CONGRESS		
SD	GOP	ND	SD	GOP	ND

#### COALITION SUPPORT

Both Chambers	61%	68%	11%	66%	72%	13%
Senate	69	65	17	66	68	17
House	57	70	7	66	75	10

#### COALITION OPPOSITION

Both Chambers	26	22	75	23	19	72
Senate	21	23	65	24	21	60
House	29	21	81	23	18	80

The figures above indicate that during the 86th Congress, the average Republican Senator and the average Southern Democratic Senator backed the coalition with about equal consistency (68 and 66 percent respectively), while the average Republican Representative tended to support the coalition with slightly more frequency than the average Southern Democratic Representative (75 and 66 percent respectively).

### Regional Scores

The parties' composite Coalition Support scores, by region, for 1960:

	East	West	South	Midwest
<b>DEMOCRATS</b>				
Both Chambers	11%	14%	61%	8%
Senate	22	20	69	7
House	7	5	57	9
<b>REPUBLICANS</b>				
Both Chambers	58%	77%	70%	75%
Senate	60	66	52	73
House	57	84	79	76

The parties' composite Coalition Opposition scores, by region, for 1960:

	East	West	South	Midwest
<b>DEMOCRATS</b>				
Both Chambers	75%	71%	26%	79%
Senate	60	63	21	73
House	80	82	29	82
<b>REPUBLICANS</b>				
Both Chambers	33%	14%	24%	14%
Senate	34	21	38	11
House	32	10	16	16

The figures above indicate that:

- Among Democrats, Southerners were, of course, the most consistent backers of the conservative coalition. Democrats from all other sections tended to oppose the coalition.

- Among Republicans, there was general support for the coalition. The weakest support among Republican House Members was from the East, and among Republican Senators, from the East and the South. The only Republican Senators from the South were John Sherman Cooper and Thruston B. Morton of Kentucky.

### Individual Scores

Highest Coalition Support scorers -- those who voted with the conservative coalition most consistently in 1960:

#### Senate

<u>Southern Democrats</u>		<u>Republicans</u>	
Stennis (Miss.)	98%	Hickenlooper (Iowa)	96%
Robertson (Va.)	96	Dirksen (Ill.)	93
Byrd (Va.)	96	Curtis (Neb.)	91
McClellan (Ark.)	96	Dworshak (Idaho)	89
Ellender (La.)	93	Williams (Del.)	89
Holland (Fla.)	93	Carlson (Kan.)	87

#### Northern Democrats

Frear (Del.)	78%	Bible (Nev.)	50%
Hayden (Ariz.)	59	Byrd (W.Va.)	48
Lausche (Ohio)	50		

#### House

**Southern Democrats** -- Four scored 100 percent: Taylor (N.C.), Murray (Tenn.); Fisher (Texas) and Gary (Va.). Others scoring high (all 95 percent): Selden (Ala.); Gathings (Ark.); Haley (Fla.); Flynt (Ga.); Brooks (La.); Abernethy (Miss.); Ashmore, Dorn, McMillan (S.C.); Abbott, Downing, Hardy and Smith (Va.).



Republicans -- Seventeen scored 100 percent: Teague, Utt (Calif.); Allen, Michel, Springer (Ill.); Avery (Kan.); McIntire (Maine); Cederberg (Mich.); Nelsen (Minn.); Becker, Derounian, Ostertag, Pillion, Wharton (N.Y.); Betts (Ohio); Pelly (Wash.); and Van Pelt (Wis.).

#### Northern Democrats

Brock (Neb.)	79%	Hull (Mo.)	32%
Jones (Mo.)	47	Cannon (Mo.)	32
McGinley (Neb.)	37	Johnson (Md.)	32

Highest Coalition Opposition scorers -- those who voted against the conservative coalition most consistently:

#### Senate

##### Southern Democrats

Gore (Tenn.)	65%
Monroney (Okla.)	63
Yarborough (Texas)	57
Johnson (Texas)	48
Kefauver (Tenn.)	39

##### Republicans

Javits (N.Y.)	72%
Case (N.J.)	72
Keating (N.Y.)	65
Cooper (Ky.)	59
Scott (Pa.)	54
Kuchel (Calif.)	54
Smith (Maine)	52

#### Northern Democrats

Douglas (Ill.)	96%	Engle (Calif.)	91%
Carroll (Colo.)	96	Hart (Mich.)	91
Jackson (Wash.)	91	Young (Ohio)	89
		Proxmire (Wis.)	89

(Sen. John F. Kennedy (Mass.), the Democratic Presidential nominee, actively opposed the coalition position on 48 percent of the Senate coalition roll calls and did not cast a single vote in its support. Sen. Lyndon B. Johnson (D Texas), the Democratic Vice Presidential nominee, had a 46 percent support, 48 percent opposition score.)

#### House

##### Southern Democrats

Perkins (Ky.)	89%
Brooks (Texas)	84
Bass (Tenn.)	84
Watts (Ky.)	84
Burke (Ky.)	84

##### Republicans

Van Zandt (Pa.)	84%
Fulton (Pa.)	84
Corbett (Pa.)	84
Halpern (N.Y.)	84
Fenton (Pa.)	79
Lindsay (N.Y.)	79
Dwyer (N.J.)	79
Rogers (Mass.)	79
Dorn (N.Y.)	79
O'Konski (Wis.)	79

**Northern Democrats** -- Twenty scored 100 percent opposition: Cohelan, Johnson, Sisk (Calif.); Kowalski (Conn.); Pfost (Idaho); Price, Shipley (Ill.); Wampler (Ind.); Smith, Wolf (Iowa); George (Kan.); O'Hara (Mich.); Karth, Wier (Minn.); Randall, Sullivan (Mo.); Thompson (N.J.); Porter (Ore.); Toll (Pa.); Johnson (Wis.).

### Coalition Issues

Listed below are the major issues, mostly domestic welfare questions, on which the conservative coalition voted in 1960. The roll call (RC) numbers refer to the list of roll calls beginning on the next page.

#### SENATE

In the Senate, the coalition took these positions:

**Campaign Spending:** Voted against an amendment to require reports on campaign contributions and spending

in primary elections; the coalition lost (RC 1).

**Aid to Education:** Defeated an amendment to authorize \$1.1 billion per year for an indefinite period for school construction and teachers' salaries and nailed down the victory with the help of a tie-breaking vote by Vice President Nixon (RC 10,11).

**Civil Rights:** Defeated a motion to invoke cloture on the filibuster (RC 34). Defeated two attempts to add Part III, empowering the Attorney General to seek injunctions to protect any civil right (RC 35, 59). On four votes, defeated attempts to add alternatives to the Administration plan for court-appointed voting referees or to ease the process for Negroes seeking registration from the referees (RC 42, 44, 60, 61). Defeated an amendment to establish a Permanent Commission on Equal Job Opportunity (RC 57). Defeated an amendment that provided technical assistance to areas desegregating their schools and endorsed the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision (RC 58). Won all nine votes.

**Depressed Areas:** Voted against a bill authorizing \$251 million in federal loans and grants for the relief of economically depressed rural and industrial areas and against overriding the President's veto of the bill; lost on the first, won on the second (RC 98, 103).

**Housing:** Voted against an amendment to authorize construction of an additional 37,000 public housing units and against one to authorize 25,000 units; won on the first, lost on the second (RC 125, 126).

**Taxes:** Defeated an attempt to repeal the 10 percent passenger transportation tax (RC 141). Voted against repeal of the 4 percent tax credit on dividend income; lost (RC 142). Defeated establishment of a 20 percent withholding tax on income from interest and dividends (RC 144). Voted against an amendment to prohibit tax deductions for business entertainment expenses, limit business gift deductions and prohibit deduction of club dues and initiation fees; lost (RC 145). Defeated reduction of oil depletion allowance (RC 147). Won three, lost two.

**Minimum Wage:** Voted for four amendments to reduce the number of new workers to be covered and lower the proposed minimum wage; lost on all four (RC 179, 182, 183, 184). Voted against passage of the bill, raising the minimum wage to \$1.25 and extending coverage to about 4 million workers; lost (RC 187).

**Medical Aid to the Aged:** Defeated an amendment to provide medical benefits for all Social Security retirees 68 and over, to be financed by Social Security taxes; won (RC 192).

#### HOUSE

In the House, the coalition took these positions:

**Urban Renewal:** Voted against appropriation of \$50 million for urban renewal grants; won (RC 6).

**Depressed Areas:** Voted against passage of a bill authorizing \$251 million in federal loans and grants to economically depressed areas; lost (RC 36).

**Aid to Education:** Voted for a substitute measure in an attempt to kill the bill authorizing \$325 million a year for four years for school construction grants and against passage; lost on both (RC 50, 53).

**Patents:** Voted to relinquish Government ownership of patents under NASA research contracts; won (RC 58).

**Minimum Wage:** Voted to cut the proposed minimum wage raise and extension of coverage; won (RC 75).

## 65 VOTES IN 1960 WHICH IDENTIFY THE 'CONSERVATIVE COALITION'

The following are the Senate and House votes for 1960 on which a majority of voting Southern Democrats joined a majority of voting Republicans to oppose the position taken by a majority of voting Northern Democrats, thus forming the "Conservative Coalition" which is the subject of this study. For a listing of the coalition votes during 1959, see 1959 Almanac, p. 136, those roll-call votes with an asterisk (\*).

The roll calls are listed in their chronological order by the Congressional Quarterly roll call number.

Note that 10 of the 19 House coalition votes for 1960 were cast May 4, during parliamentary maneuvering on a single measure, the Area Redevelopment Act.

### Senate Roll Calls (46)

RC 1 -- S 2436. Prevent corrupt practices in federal elections by limiting campaign funds and requiring certain reports. Hennings (D Mo.) and Keating (R N.Y.) amendment to require reports on campaign contributions and spending for candidates and committees in primary elections (including preferential primaries) and conventions or caucuses. Agreed to 50-39 (SD 4-17; ND 30-4; R 16-18), Jan. 19, 1960. The President did not take a position on the amendment; a "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 2 -- S 2436. Hennings (D Mo.) amendment to require political committees operating within one state to report contributions and expenditures in federal elections which exceed \$2,500 annually. Agreed to 53-37 (SD 5-16; ND 34-2; R 14-19), Jan. 20, 1960. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 5 -- S J Res 39. Amend the Constitution to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives under emergency conditions. Holland (D Fla.) motion to lay on the table a Javits (R N.Y.) amendment, in the nature of a substitute for S J Res 39, to prohibit use of the poll tax or property requirements as qualifications for voting in federal elections through statute rather than constitutional amendment. Tabling motion agreed to 50-37 (SD 21-1; ND 11-21; R 18-15), Feb. 2, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 10 -- S 8. Emergency Federal Assistance for School Construction. Clark (D Pa.) amendment to Committee bill to authorize \$25 per school-age child, or \$1.1 billion, per year for an indefinite period for school construction and teachers' salaries. Rejected 44-44 (SD 7-14; ND 32-3; R 5-27), Feb. 3, 1960. (A majority vote is required for adoption of an amendment.) A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position and also that of the coalition.

RC 11 -- S 8. Dirksen (R Ill.) motion to table a motion to reconsider the vote on Clark's amendment. Vice President Nixon voted "yea" to break a 44-44 tie (SD 14-7; ND 2-33; R 28-4), Feb. 3, 1960. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position, and also that of the coalition.

RC 13 -- S 8. School Construction Assistance Act of 1960. Morse (D Ore.) amendment to Committee bill to include a two-year program of \$75 million in loans to private schools at 2.75 percent interest rate for school construction. Rejected 37-49 (SD 2-19; ND 22-11; R 13-19), Feb. 4, 1960. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position and also that of the coalition.

RC 34 -- Civil Rights Proposals. Douglas (D Ill.)-Javits (R N.Y.) motion to limit debate by invoking cloture on the civil rights filibuster (two-thirds majority required). Rejected 42-53 (SD 0-24; ND 30-9; R 12-20), March 10, 1960 (64 "yeas" were required for adoption). The President did not take a position on the motion. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 35 -- Civil Rights Proposals. Johnson (D Texas) motion to table Case (R S.D.) amendment to the pending Administration bill to add Part III, empowering the Attorney General to seek injunctions to protect any civil right. Tabling motion agreed to 55-38 (SD 24-0; ND 10-28; R 21-10), March 10, 1960. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position and also that of the coalition.

RC 42 -- Civil Rights Proposals. Dirksen (R Ill.) motion to table Douglas (D Ill.)-Javits (R N.Y.) amendment to the third section of the Administration bill, to provide for Presidential appointment of federal registrars to enroll Negroes after the President received 50 complaints of discrimination and investigated them. Tabling motion agreed to 53-24 (SD 21-0; ND 8-19; R 24-5), March 18, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 44 -- Civil Rights Proposals. Morse (D Ore.) motion to table a Javits-Clark (D Pa.) amendment to the third section of the Administration bill, to provide for court-appointed referees or Presidentially appointed enrollment officers to register Negroes after a court has found a pattern or practice of discrimination. Tabling motion agreed to 51-43 (SD 21-3; ND 6-32; R 24-8), March 24, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 57 -- HR 8601. Civil Rights Act of 1960. Dirksen (R Ill.) motion to table Javits (R N.Y.) amendment to establish a permanent Commission on Equal Job Opportunity. Tabling motion agreed to 48-38 (SD 23-0; ND 4-27; R 21-11), April 1, 1960. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 58 -- HR 8601. Mansfield (D Mont.) motion to table Keating (R N.Y.) amendment providing technical assistance to areas desegregating their schools and endorsing the Supreme Court's 1954 desegregation decision and Cooper (R Ky.) amendment deleting the endorsement. Tabling motion agreed to 61-30 (SD 24-0; ND 13-20; R 24-10), April 4, 1960. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 59 -- HR 8601. Dirksen (R Ill.) motion to table Javits (R N.Y.) amendment to allow the Attorney General to enter private suits for school desegregation and McNamara (D Mich.) amendment to add Part III, empowering the Attorney General to seek injunctions to protect any civil right. Tabling motion agreed to 56-34 (SD 24-0; ND 9-23; R 23-11), April 4, 1960. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position and also that of the coalition.

RC 60 -- HR 8601. Dirksen (R Ill.) motion to table Hart (D Mich.) amendment to the referees plan, requiring that a Negro must prove to the referee only that he is qualified to vote. Tabling motion agreed to 52-38 (SD 22-2; ND 7-25; R 23-11), April 4, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 61 -- HR 8601. Dirksen (R Ill.) motion to table Hennings (D Mo.) amendment to referee section, adding a plan for Presidentially appointed enrollment officers to register Negroes. Tabling motion agreed to 58-26 (SD 24-0; ND 10-21; R 24-5), April 4, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 65 -- HR 8601. Dirksen (R Ill.) motion to table Carroll (D Colo.) amendment to the referees provision to permit the courts to waive the requirements that a Negro seeking a court certificate to vote must prove he tried to register with state authorities and was rejected after a pattern of discrimination was found by the courts. Tabling motion agreed to 62-32 (SD 21-3; ND 13-23; R 28-6), April 6, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 82 -- S 3058. Mutual Security Act of 1960. Ellender (D La.) amendment to delete a provision authorizing grants of surplus agricultural commodities to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas. Agreed to 45-38 (SD 15-6; ND 14-18; R 16-14), May 2, 1960. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 91 -- S 3058. Johnson (D Texas) motion to table (kill) a Fulbright (D Ark.) amendment specifying that the President need not apply the freedom of navigation principles expressed in the Douglas amendment (RC 77) in situations where nations receiving U.S. aid are engaged in actions detrimental to United Nations peace efforts. Tabling motion agreed to 45-39 (SD 5-16; ND 26-7; R 14-16), May 2, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 98 -- S 722. Area Redevelopment Act. Authorize federal loans and grants totaling \$251 million for the relief of economically depressed rural and industrial areas. Johnson (D Texas) motion to concur in the House version of the bill. Agreed to 45-32 (SD 6-9; ND 34-2; R 5-21), May 6, 1960. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position and also that of the coalition.

RC 101 -- S 2653. Require the licensing and regulation of community antenna television systems by the Federal Communications Commission. Monroney (D Okla.) motion to recommit (kill) the bill. Agreed to 39-38 (SD 15-1; ND 4-25; R 20-12), May 18, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 102 -- S 2653. Kerr (D Okla.) motion to table a Dirksen (R Ill.) motion to reconsider the vote that recommitment the community antenna TV bill to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Tabling motion agreed to 38-36 (SD 15-1; ND 4-25; R 19-10), May 18, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 103 -- S 722. Area Redevelopment Act of 1960, authorizing federal loans and grants totaling \$251 million for the relief of economically depressed areas. Passage of the bill over the President's veto (two-thirds majority required). Failed to pass 45-39 (SD 8-12; ND 32-2; R 5-25), May 24, 1960 (56 "yeas" were required to override the veto). A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position and also that of the coalition.

RC 108 -- HR 10087. Permit U.S. firms with foreign holdings to claim credits against U.S. taxes for taxes paid to foreign countries either on a country-by-country basis or by treating all foreign taxes collectively. Gore (D Tenn.) motion to recommit (kill) the bill. Rejected 24-58 (SD 5-15; ND 17-10; R 2-33), June 1, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 110 -- S 3074. Authorize United States membership in the International Development Assn. Williams (R Del.) amendment prohibiting the U.S. from making "gift" donations of U.S.-owned foreign currencies to the IDA without prior Congressional approval. Agreed to 39-33 (SD 11-9; ND 9-12; R 19-12), June 2, 1960. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 117 -- S 2759. Wheat Act of 1960, setting wheat price supports for the 1961, the 1962 and 1963 crop years and cutting total wheat acreage 20 percent. Ellender (D La.) amendment to set price supports at 75 percent in 1961, 70 percent in 1962 and 65 percent in 1963 and cut acreage 20 percent. Agreed to 45-41 (SD 11-9; ND 14-19; R 20-13), June 9, 1960. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position and also that of the coalition. (This amendment was later reconsidered and rejected).

RC 121 -- S 2759. Wheat Act of 1960. Ellender (D La.) amendment to continue existing price supports at 75 percent of parity for crop years 1961-63, to cut total acreage by 20 percent, and to authorize payments-in-kind equal to 50 percent of potential production on land retired under the acreage cut. Agreed to 48-34 (SD 11-8; ND 13-20; R 24-6), June 9, 1960. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position and also that of the coalition.

RC 123 -- S J Res 170. Authorize appointment jointly by the Senate and the House of a private citizen U.S. Commission on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, provide for the Commission's participation in an international convention of citizens from NATO nations, and authorize \$300,000 for Commission expenses. Passed 51-44 (SD 10-14; ND 30-9; R 11-21), June 15, 1960. The President did not take a position on the bill. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 125 -- S 3670. Housing Act of 1960. Clark (D Pa.) amendment to authorize construction of an additional 37,000 public housing units. Rejected 38-42 (SD 6-14; ND 25-5; R 7-23), June 16, 1960. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position and also that of the coalition.

RC 126 -- S 3670. Clark (D Pa.) amendment to authorize construction of an additional 25,000 public housing units. Agreed to 42-39 (SD 6-14; ND 29-2; R 7-23), June 16, 1960. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position and also that of the coalition.

RC 127 -- S 3670. Bennett (R Utah) amendment to eliminate a provision requiring an annual estimate by the President of the Nation's housing needs. Agreed to 44-37 (SD 11-9; ND 5-26; R 28-2), June 16, 1960. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 139 -- HR 12381. Provide a one-year increase in the national debt ceiling from its permanent level of \$285 billion to \$293 billion and extend for one year the current 52 percent corporate income tax rate, certain excise tax rates and the 10 percent taxes on local telephone calls and passenger transportation. Johnson (D Texas) motion to table Gore (D Tenn.) amendment which would add to the Finance Committee amendments repealing telephone and transportation taxes a provision to prevent excessive depletion deductions on certain minerals. Tabling motion agreed to 39-26 (SD 11-6; ND 9-19; R 19-1), June 18, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 141 -- HR 12381. Finance Committee amendment to repeal the 10 percent tax on passenger transportation. Rejected 29-55 (SD 6-15; ND 18-15; R 5-25), June 20, 1960. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position and also that of the coalition.

RC 142 -- HR 12381. McCarthy (D Minn.) amendment to repeal the 4 percent tax credit on dividend income exceeding \$50 from domestic corporations. Agreed to 42-41 (SD 9-10; ND 30-2; R 3-29), June 20, 1960. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position and also that of the coalition.

RC 144 -- HR 12381. Proxmire (D Wis.) amendment to establish a 20 percent withholding tax on income from interest and dividends. Rejected 24-62 (SD 3-18; ND 19-13; R 2-31), June 20, 1960. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position and also that of the coalition.

RC 145 -- HR 12381. Provide for a one-year increase in the national debt ceiling and extend corporate and certain excise tax rates. Clark (D Pa.) amendment to prohibit tax deductions for business entertainment expenses, except for food and beverages, to limit to \$10 per person the amount of a business gift that is tax deductible and to prohibit deductions for dues or initiation fees to social, athletic or sporting clubs. Agreed to 45-39 (SD 8-13; ND 28-3; R 9-23), June 20, 1960. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 147 -- HR 12381. Douglas (D Ill.) amendment to reduce the across-the-board 27.5 percent depletion allowance for oil and gas producers and substitute the following allowance scale: 27.5 percent for producers earning less than \$1 million a year, 21 percent for producers earning between \$1 million and \$5 million a year and 15 percent for producers earning more than \$5 million a year. Rejected 30-56 (SD 4-17; ND 18-14; R 8-25), June 20, 1960. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 153 -- HR 11776. Appropriate \$8,459,412,900 for independent federal agencies in fiscal 1961. Magnuson (D Wash.) motion to table Javits (R N.Y.) amendment prohibiting the use of funds for the construction of airport facilities which would contain segregated facilities. Tabling motion agreed to 58-29 (SD 21-0; ND 14-19; R 23-10), June 22, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 160 -- HR 12381. Public Debt Limit and Tax Extension Act of 1960, providing for an increase in the national debt limit and extending corporate and certain excise tax rates for one year. Adoption of the conference report. Agreed to 61-32 (SD 17-5; ND 10-27; R 34-0), June 28, 1960. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position and also that of the coalition.

RC 178 -- S 3758. Increase minimum wage and overtime protection and extend coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. Holland (D Fla.) amendment to prohibit the Secretary of Labor from regulating the conditions of employment of all U.S. migrant agricultural workers. Rejected 42-56 (SD 16-8; ND 4-37; R 22-11), Aug. 16, 1960. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 179 -- S 3758. Holland (D Fla.) amendment to reduce the number of new workers to be covered from about 5 million to about 280,000. Rejected 39-56 (SD 15-8; ND 4-36; R 20-12), Aug. 17, 1960. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 182 -- S 3758. Dirksen (R Ill.) amendment, in the form of a substitute, to provide a minimum wage raise to \$1.15 and extend \$1 minimum wage but not overtime protection to workers employed by retail or service chains having five or more establishments and operating in two or more states. Rejected 39-54 (SD 14-9; ND 2-35; R 23-10), Aug. 17, 1960. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position and also that of the coalition.



RC 183 -- S 3758. Prouty (R Vt.) amendment to retain the proposed \$1.25 minimum wage but provide \$1.10 for newly covered workers and limit extension of coverage. Rejected 41-56 (SD 13-11; ND 2-38; R 26-7), Aug. 17, 1960. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 184 -- S 3758. Morse (D Ore.) motion to table Monroney (D Okla.) amendment to limit coverage extension to retail and service employees in chains operating in two or more states, regardless of the employer's volume of business. Tabling motion agreed to 50-48 (SD 5-19; ND 37-4; R 8-25), Aug. 18, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 186 -- S 3758. Cooper (R Ky.) amendment to retain existing overtime exemptions for certain workers in industries processing agricultural commodities. Accepted 50-46 (SD 17-7; ND 2-37; R 31-2), Aug. 18, 1960. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 187 -- HR 12677. Senate-amended version of the House's minimum wage bill, raising the minimum wage to \$1.25 and extending coverage to about 4 million workers. Passed 62-34 (SD 11-13; ND 36-3; R 15-18), Aug. 18, 1960. The President did not take a position on the bill. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 192 -- HR 12580. Social Security Amendments of 1960. Anderson (D N.M.) amendment providing medical benefits for all Social Security retirees 68 and over, to be financed by an increase in the Social Security payroll tax. Rejected 44-51 (SD 4-18; ND 39-1; R 1-32), Aug. 23, 1960. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position and also that of the coalition.

### House Roll Calls (19)

RC 6 -- HR 10743. Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill for fiscal 1960. Yates (D Ill.) amendment to appropriate \$50 million, as proposed in the budget but refused by the Appropriations Committee, to liquidate obligations already made for urban renewal and slum-clearance grants. Rejected 158-187 (SD 32-64; ND 107-13; R 19-110), Feb. 29, 1960. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 26 -- S 722. Area Redevelopment Act. Authorize federal loans and grants totaling \$251 million for the relief of economically depressed rural and industrial areas. Davis (D Ga.) motion to table McCormack (D Mass.) motion to dispense with further proceedings and order the previous question. Tabling motion rejected 167-222 (SD 52-41; ND 2-152; R 113-24) May 4, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion; a "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 27 -- S 722. Area Redevelopment Act. McCormack (D Mass.) motion to order the previous question (end debate) on dispensing with further proceedings. Agreed to 223-164 (SD 40-53; ND 152-2; R 31-109) May 4, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion; a "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 28 -- S 722. Area Redevelopment Act. McCormack (D Mass.) motion to dispense with further proceedings. Agreed to 224-160 (SD 38-52; ND 152-1; R 34-107) May 4, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion; a "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 29 -- S 722. Area Redevelopment Act. Davis (D Ga.) motion to table second McCormack (D Mass.) motion to dispense with further proceedings and order the previous question. Tabling motion rejected 153-231 (SD 51-39; ND 1-53; R 101-39), May 4, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion; a "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 30 -- S 722. Area Redevelopment Act. McCormack (D Mass.) motion to order the previous question (end debate) on dispensing with further proceedings. Agreed to 235-153 (SD 40-51; ND 154-1; R 41-101), May 4, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion; a "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 31 -- S 722. Area Redevelopment Act. McCormack (D Mass.) motion to dispense with further proceedings. Agreed to 237-152 (SD 41-52; ND 153-1; R 43-99) May 4, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion; a "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 32 -- S 722. McCormack (D Mass.) motion to order the previous question on dispensing with further proceedings. Agreed to 238-148 (SD 44-48; ND 153-1; R 41-99), May 4, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion; a "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 33 -- S 722. Area Redevelopment Act. McCormack (D Mass.) motion to dispense with further proceedings. Agreed to 238-150 (SD 43-50; ND 153-0; R 42-100), May 4, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion; a "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 34 -- S 722. Area Redevelopment Act. Halleck (R Ind.) question of whether the House would consider the bill. Agreed to 221-171 (SD 39-56; ND 154-2; R 28-113) May 4, 1960. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position; a "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 36 -- S 722. Area Redevelopment Act. Passage of the bill, authorizing \$251 million in federal loans and grants to chronically depressed industrial and rural areas. Passed 202-184 (SD 29-63; ND 150-6; R 23-115) May 4, 1960. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position and also the position of the coalition.

RC 45 -- H Res 488. A rule for debate on HR 2331, to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park in Maryland. (Cost for the first five years was estimated at \$8,550,000; total cost was estimated at \$12 million.) The Budget Bureau did not oppose the bill. Motion to adopt the rule rejected 134-227 (SD 18-64; ND 97-40; R 19-123) May 19, 1960. The President did not take a position on the bill; a "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 50 -- HR 10128. School Construction Assistance Act of 1960. Bow (R Ohio) amendment, in the nature of a substitute, to return to each state annually, for school construction use, 25 percent of the federal tax on cigarettes sold in the state. Rejected 181-219 (SD 80-19; ND 6-156; R 95-44) May 26, 1960. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position; a "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 53 -- HR 10128 -- School Construction Assistance Act of 1960, authorizing \$325 million a year for four years in federal matching grants to the states for public school construction. Passage of the bill. Passed 206-189 (SD 10-89; ND 152-8; R 44-92) May 26, 1960. The President did not take a position on the bill; a "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 56 -- H Res 550. A closed rule for debate on HR 12381, increasing the national debt ceiling for one year from \$258 billion to \$293 billion and extending for one year the current corporate income tax rate, certain excise tax rates and taxes on local telephone calls and passenger transportation. Rule adopted 204-181 (SD 56-38 ND 56-95; R 92-48), June 8, 1960. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position and also the coalition's position.

RC 58 -- HR 10249. Amendment to the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. Sisk (D Calif.) motion to recommit the bill to the House Science and Astronautics Committee with instructions to delete a section relinquishing Government ownership of patents under NASA research contracts. Rejected 120-270 (SD 17-79; ND 103-50; R 0-141) June 9, 1960. The President did not take a position on the motion; a "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 75 -- HR 12677. Increase minimum wage protection under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. Kitchin (D N.C.) substitute amendment for the Committee bill, extending \$1-an-hour wage protection but no overtime protection to employees of interstate retail chains and raising the hourly minimum for previously covered workers to \$1.15. Agreed to 211-203 (SD 84-18; ND 6-158; R 121-27), June 30, 1960. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position and also that of the coalition.

RC 82 -- HR 2467. Authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to pay a relocation allowance to owners or tenants forced to move off land acquired by the FAA. Committee substitute amendment for the bill as introduced, which covered only residents of Chantilly, Va. Agreed to 190-164 (SD 66-24; ND 23-114; R 101-26) July 2, 1960. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 83 -- HR 2467 (see above). Passage of the bill as amended. Passed 183-167 (SD 65-25; ND 22-111; R 96-31) July 2, 1960. The President did not take a position on the bill. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

## Conservative Support-Opposition Scores

### Senate Conservative Coalition - 1960 and 86th Congress

The chart below shows how often individual Senators voted "with" and "against" the conservative coalition. The figures are based on Senate roll calls on which the majority of voting Republicans and the majority of voting Southern Democrats, forming a conservative coalition, opposed the stand taken by the majority of voting Northern Democrats.

1. CONSERVATIVE COALITION SUPPORT, 1960. Percentage of 46 conservative coalition roll calls on which Senator voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.
2. CONSERVATIVE COALITION OPPOSITION, 1960. Percentage of 46 conservative coalition roll calls on which Senator voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.
3. CONSERVATIVE COALITION SUPPORT, 86th Congress. Percentage of 86 conservative coalition roll calls in 1959 and 1960 on which Senator voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.
4. CONSERVATIVE COALITION OPPOSITION, 86th Congress. Percentage of 86 conservative coalition roll calls in 1959 and 1960 on which Senator voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

\*Not eligible for all coalition roll calls during the period of the study.

-Not a Senator during the period of the study.

†Died after the end of the 1960 session.

Scores for Sen. Richard L. Neuberger (D Ore.)  
who served until his death March 9, 1960:

Col. 3      Col. 4  
9            70

1 2 3 4					1 2 3 4					1 2 3 4					CONSERVATIVE COALITION 1960				
ALABAMA					INDIANA					NEBRASKA					SOUTH CAROLINA				
Hill	61	33	50	44	Hartke	4	76	16	64	Curtis	91	9	94	6	Johnston	70	26	62	35
Sparkman	52	24	45	40	Capehart	63	4	65	10	Hruska	83	7	83	6	Thurmond	89	7	94	3
ALASKA					IOWA					NEVADA					SOUTH DAKOTA				
Bartlett	11	83	19	74	Hickenlooper	96	2	93	1	Bible	50	50	56	40	Case	76	20	66	14
Gruening	15	85	16	78	Martin	65	15	74	9	Cannon	39	57	42	56	Mundt	72	13	76	13
ARIZONA					KANSAS					NEW HAMPSHIRE					TENNESSEE				
Hayden	59	24	58	31	Carlson	87	11	77	13	Bridges	70	2	70	2	Gore	28	65	24	66
Goldwater	63	4	67	3	Schoeppel	72	11	81	8	Cotton	83	7	87	3	Kefauver	22	39	19	51
ARKANSAS					KENTUCKY					NEW JERSEY					TEXAS				
Fulbright	61	22	53	26	Cooper	39	59	43	53	Williams	11	80	9	84	Johnson	46	48	44	48
McClellan	96	2	97	1	Morton	65	17	73	16	Case	22	72	36	59	Yarborough	30	57	23	67
CALIFORNIA					LOUISIANA					NEW MEXICO					UTAH				
Engle	4	91	10	85	Ellender	93	4	81	10	Anderson	30	54	34	52	Moss	9	70	12	73
Kuchel	43	54	50	43	Long	65	33	53	42	Chavez	35	26	33	30	Bennett	80	2	80	3
COLORADO					MAINE					NEW YORK					VERMONT				
Carroll	0	96	0	98	Muskie	15	61	13	67	Javits	26	72	30	66	Aiken	63	33	55	36
Allott	63	26	76	17	Smith	48	52	57	43	Keating	33	65	47	51	Prouty	74	26	69	26
CONNECTICUT					MARYLAND					NORTH CAROLINA					VIRGINIA				
Dodd	9	65	15	65	Beall	59	30	66	23	Ervin	87	7	85	7	Byrd	96	0	94	0
Bush	72	26	74	21	Butler	78	7	79	5	Jordan	87	2	85	3	Robertson	96	0	97	0
DELAWARE					MASSACHUSETTS					NORTH DAKOTA					WASHINGTON				
Frazar	78	15	74	14	Kennedy	0	48	1	56	Burdick	0*	88*	-	-	Jackson	7	91	6	92
Williams	89	11	93	7	Saltonstall	76	20	79	16	Young	80	15	76	17	Magnuson	4	76	6	80
FLORIDA					MICHIGAN					OHIO					WEST VIRGINIA				
Holland	92	2	92	2	Hart	2	91	3	92	Lausche	50	50	65	35	Byrd	48	50	42	56
Smathers	59	13	62	14	McNamara	0	78	1	81	Young	4	89	12	84	Randolph	15	72	20	69
GEORGIA					MINNESOTA					OKLAHOMA					WISCONSIN				
Russell	80	9	83	6	Humphrey	0	63	1	71	Kerr	54	33	55	34	Proxmire	2	89	6	90
Talmadge	80	7	86	5	McCarthy	4	72	3	79	Monroney	33	63	28	66	Wiley	54	24	53	23
HAWAII					MISSISSIPPI					OREGON					WYOMING				
Long	11	87	9*	87*	Eastland	74	0	78	2	Morse	4	76	2	84	McGee	24	63	19	65
Fong	57	35	61*	31*	Stennis	98	0	98	0	Lusk	43*	46*	-	-	O'Mahoney	9	17	9	22
IDAHO					MISSOURI					PENNSYLVANIA									
Church	13	70	13	63	Hennings†	4	35	7	52	Clark	9	80	6	85					
Dworsbak	89	7	90	3	Symington	4	65	6	73	Scott	43	54	55	44					
ILLINOIS					MONTANA					RHODE ISLAND									
Douglas	2	96	5	90	Mansfield	26	63	23	69	Green	28	46	26	52					
Dirksen	93	4	87	3	Murray	17	39	13	40	Pastore	11	80	16	77					

Democrats in this type, Republicans in italics



## Conservative Support-Opposition Scores

### House Conservative Coalition - 1960 and 86th Congress

The chart below shows how often individual Representatives voted "with" and "against" the conservative coalition. The figures are based on House roll calls on which the majority of voting Republicans and the majority of voting Southern Democrats, forming a conservative coalition, opposed the stand taken by the majority of voting Northern Democrats.

1. CONSERVATIVE COALITION SUPPORT, 1960. Percentage of 19 conservative coalition roll calls on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.
2. CONSERVATIVE COALITION OPPOSITION, 1960. Percentage of 19 conservative coalition roll calls on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.
3. CONSERVATIVE COALITION SUPPORT, 86th Congress. Percentage of 30 conservative coalition roll calls on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.
4. CONSERVATIVE COALITION OPPOSITION, 86th Congress. Percentage of 30 conservative coalition roll calls on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

\*Not eligible for all coalition roll calls during the period of the study.

-Not a Member of the House during the period of the study.

†Died after the end of the 1960 session.

	1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4
<b>ALABAMA</b>																			
3 Andrews	42	5	60	7		25 Kase	0	79	0	77	<b>HAWAII</b>								
1 Boykin	37	5	50	10		17 King	5	95	3	97	AL Inouye	11	84	-	-				
7 Elliott	16	79	23	57		26 Roosevelt	0	95	0	97	<b>IDAHO</b>								
2 Grant	42	0	53	10		21 Hiestand	89	0	93	0	1 Pfost	0	100	10	87				
9 Huddleston	84	16	83	17		22 Holt	84	11	90	7	2 Budge	95	0	93	0				
8 Jones	26	58	40	50		18 Hosmer	89	11	87	13	<b>ILLINOIS</b>								
5 Rains	26	21	40	27		16 Jackson	32	0	53	0	25 Gray	11	89	7	93				
4 Roberts	37	11	47	10		24 Lipscomb	95	5	97	3	21 Mack	5	84	7	83				
6 Selden	95	5	97	3		15 McDonough	89	5	93	3	24 Price	0	100	0	100				
<b>ALASKA</b>						20 Smith	95	5	97	3	23 Shipley	0	100	0	100				
AL Rivers	16	84	17	80		<b>COLORADO</b>					16 Allen	100	0	100	0				
<b>ARIZONA</b>						4 Aspinall	11	89	23	73	17 Arends	79	0	83	3				
2 Udall	5	79	7	83		2 Johnson	0	79	7	77	19 Chipfield	89	0	83	3				
1 Rhodes	95	5	93	7		1 Rogers	11	37	23	43	14 Hoffman	95	5	97	3				
<b>ARKANSAS</b>						3 Chenoweth	42	58	63	37	15 Mason	74	0	80	0				
5 Alford	74	0	77	7		<b>CONNECTICUT</b>					18 Michel	100	0	100	0				
1 Gathings	95	5	97	3		2 Bowles	5	79	3	87	20 Simpson	84	16	90	10				
4 Harris	79	16	80	13		1 Daddario	5	95	3	97	22 Springer	100	0	97	3				
2 Mills	58	42	70	30		3 Gioimo	5	95	3	97	<b>Chicago-Cook County</b>								
6 Norrell	74	11	83	7		4 Irwin	11	84	10	87	12 Vacancy								
3 Trimble	42	58	50	50		AL Kowalski	0	100	3	93	1 Dawson	5	79	3	87				
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>						5 Monagan	11	84	17	80	5 Kluczynski	16	68	13	77				
7 Cohelan	0	100	0	97		<b>DELAWARE</b>					7 Libonati	21	79	13	87				
14 Hagen	11	89	13	83		AL McDowell	5	79	10	70	3 Murphy	5	95	7	93				
2 Johnson	0	100	0	100		<b>FLORIDA</b>					6 O'Brien	11	79	7	87				
11 McFall	5	95	7	93		2 Bennett	26	74	50	50	2 O'Hara	5	95	3	97				
1 Miller (C.W.)	0	89	0	93		4 Fascell	32	68	50	50	11 Pucinski	11	89	7	93				
8 Miller (G.P.)	0	74	0	83		7 Haley	95	5	97	3	8 Rostenkowski	5	89	3	90				
3 Moss	11	89	7	93		5 Herlong	47	0	67	0	9 Yates	5	89	7	90				
29 Sound	5	95	7	90		8 Matthews	47	53	63	37	13 Church	79	21	83	17				
5 Shelley	0	84	3	87		6 Rogers	42	58	60	40	10 Collier	84	16	90	10				
27 Sheppard	11	58	17	57		3 Sikes	42	58	57	40	4 Deruinski	89	11	90	10				
12 Sisk	0	100	0	100		1 Cramer	95	5	97	3	<b>INDIANA</b>								
6 Baldwin	74	26	63	37		<b>GEORGIA</b>					11 Barr	11	74	20	70				
10 Gubser	79	21	87	13		8 Blitch	63	11	77	7	3 Brademas	5	95	3	97				
4 Matillard	63	32	67	30		10 Brown	89	11	87	13	8 Denton	5	95	10	90				
13 Teague	100	0	100	0		5 Davis	84	5	87	3	10 Harmon	21	58	33	53				
28 Utt	100	0	100	0		4 Flynt	95	0	97	0	9 Hogan	5	95	10	90				
30 Wilner	84	11	87	10		3 Forrester	89	11	93	7	1 Madden	5	84	7	87				
9 Younger	84	0	90	0		9 Landrum	68	5	80	3	5 Roush	11	89	17	83				
<b>Los Angeles County</b>						7 Mitchell	21	53	40	43	6 Wampler	0	100	3	97				
23 Doyle	0	89	13	80		2 Pilcher	74	0	77	7	4 Adair	26	11	53	7				
19 Holifield	0	89	0	93		1 Preston	79	5	80	10	7 Bray	42	53	57	33				
						6 Vinson	74	5	80	7	2 Halleck	95	5	90	3				

CONSERVATIVE  
COALITION  
1960

IOWA

6 Coad

5 Smith

2 Wolf

3 Gross

8 Hoeven

7 Jensen

4 Kyl

1 Schwengel

**KANSAS**

5 Breeding

2 George

3 Hargis

1 Avery

4 Rees

6 Smith

**KENTUCKY**

3 Burke

4 Chelf

2 Natcher

7 Perkins

5 Spence

1 Stubblefield

6 Watts

8 Siler

**LOUISIANA**

2 Boggs

4 Brooks

1 Hebert

8 McSweeney

Democrats in this type; Republicans in italics

	1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4	
6 Morrison		5	58	23	40	<b>NEBRASKA</b>					7 Lennon	89	5	93	3	6 McMillan	95	5	97	3
5 Passman	89	5	93	3	3 Brock	79	21	83	17	5 Scott	74	0	77	0	2 Riley	79	11	87	7	
7 Thompson	0	58	20	37	4 McGinley	37	58	53	43	11 Whitener	84	11	90	7	1 Rivers	79	0	83	3	
3 Willis	79	11	83	7	2 Cunningham	53	47	67	33	10 Jonas	95	5	97	3	<b>SOUTH DAKOTA</b>					
<b>MAINE</b>					1 Weaver	42	5	63	3	<b>NORTH DAKOTA</b>					1 McGovern	0	89	7	83	
2 Coffin		5	95	10	93	<b>NEVADA</b>				AL Burdick	0	74	0	77	2 Berry	95	5	97	3	
1 Oliver	11	89	7	93	AL Baring	0	84	13	77	AL Short	74	11	80	10	<b>TENNESSEE</b>					
3 McIntire	100	0	97	3	<b>NEW HAMPSHIRE</b>					<b>OHIO</b>					6 Bass	16	84	37	63	
<b>MARYLAND</b>					2 Bass	63	37	60	37	9 Ashley	5	37	13	50	9 Davis	47	37	47	33	
2 Brewster	11	84	27	67	1 Merrow	21	26	23	40	11 Cook	11	84	17	73	8 Everett	89	11	90	10	
4 Fallon	11	84	30	63	<b>NEW JERSEY</b>					20 Feighan	16	84	20	80	4 Ewins	32	58	50	40	
6 Foley	16	84	17	80	11 Addonizio	11	89	7	93	18 Hays	5	95	7	87	3 Frazier	32	58	43	43	
7 Friedel	11	84	13	83	14 Daniels	5	95	3	97	19 Kirwan	21	63	17	70	5 Loser	84	16	83	17	
3 Garmatz	0	95	7	90	13 Gallagher	0	95	0	93	17 Levering	11	89	20	80	7 Murray	100	0	100	0	
1 Johnson	32	68	47	53	10 Rodino	11	84	7	90	10 Moeller	16	74	23	70	2 Baker	32	58	53	40	
5 Lankford	5	74	27	60	4 Thomson	0	100	0	97	6 Vacancy					1 Reece	89	0	87	0	
<b>MASSACHUSETTS</b>					3 Auerhoss	74	5	70	10	21 Vanik	5	95	7	93	<b>TEXAS</b>					
2 Boland	21	68	20	70	1 Cabell	68	16	57	33	14 Ayres	53	32	63	27	3 Beckworth	42	58	57	43	
13 Burke	5	95	7	93	8 Canfield	16	68	10	50	13 Baumhart	53	32	67	20	2 Brooks	16	84	30	70	
4 Donohue	5	79	3	83	6 Dwyer	21	79	30	70	8 Betts	100	0	100	0	17 Burleson	37	5	57	7	
7 Lane	21	79	20	77	5 Frelinghuysen	84	11	73	23	22 Bolton	95	5	93	7	22 Casey	32	68	50	47	
8 Macdonald	16	63	10	70	2 Glenn	74	16	73	17	16 Bow	95	0	93	0	7 Dowdy	42	5	63	3	
12 McCormack	21	79	20	77	9 Osmer	84	16	80	20	7 Brown	89	5	93	3	21 Fisher	100	0	100	0	
11 O'Neill	5	79	3	87	12 Walbauer	79	21	70	23	12 Devine	84	11	90	7	13 Ikard	42	58	57	43	
3 Philbin	5	79	3	83	7 Widnall	68	16	70	17	15 Henderson	79	5	87	3	20 Kilday	47	53	60	40	
6 Bates	84	16	90	10	<b>NEW MEXICO</b>					2 Hess	74	0	83	0	15 Kilgore	42	58	60	40	
1 Conte	26	74	33	67	AL Montoya	0	47	3	63	5 Latta	95	5	97	3	19 Mahon	47	53	63	33	
10 Curtis	74	11	67	23	AL Morris	16	26	40	23	4 McCulloch	95	5	97	3	1 Patman	26	74	43	57	
9 Keith	79	21	83	13	<b>NEW YORK</b>					23 Minsball	95	5	93	3	11 Poage	68	26	73	23	
14 Martin	11	42	33	27	41 Dulski	0	95	3	93	3 Schenck	95	5	97	3	4 Rayburn					
5 Rogers†	21	79	33	57	30 O'Brien	26	74	23	73	1 Scherer	84	16	90	10	18 Rogers	37	11	53	13	
<b>MICHIGAN</b>					32 Stratton	16	84	33	67	<b>OKLAHOMA</b>					16 Rutherford	47	53	60	40	
7 O'Hara	0	100	0	100	27 Barry	84	0	87	3	3 Albert	21	74	33	60	6 Teague	26	11	47	13	
12 Bennett	32	63	33	63	3 Becker	100	0	100	0	2 Edmondson	5	74	20	67	8 Thomas	16	79	27	63	
8 Bentley	11	53	40	33	2 Derouman	100	0	100	0	5 Jarman	42	58	60	40	9 Thompson	37	63	50	50	
18 Broomfield	53	47	67	33	26 Dooley	84	0	73	17	6 Morris	0	68	13	67	10 Thornberry	37	63	53	47	
10 Cederberg	100	0	97	0	33 Kilburn	16	0	30	0	4 Steed	11	53	33	40	12 Wright	38	47	57	33	
6 Chamberlain	26	74	50	47	40 Miller	47	0	50	0	1 Belcher	95	0	97	0	14 Young	47	0	63	3	
5 Ford	84	16	90	10	39 Osterlag	100	0	97	3	<b>OREGON</b>					5 Alger	95	0	97	0	
9 Griffin	58	42	70	30	42 Pillion	100	0	97	0	3 Green	0	95	3	93	<b>UTAH</b>					
4 Hoffman	95	5	90	3	34 Pirnie	89	11	90	7	4 Porter	0	100	3	90	2 King	21	79	30	70	
3 Johansen	95	5	97	3	43 Goodell	95	5	78†	15†	2 Ullman	5	95	3	97	1 Dixon	89	11	90	10	
11 Knox	58	32	73	20	35 Riehlman	89	11	90	10	1 Norblad	84	11	90	7	<b>VERMONT</b>					
2 Meader	89	0	93	0	37 Robinson	95	5	90	7	<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>					AL Meyer	0	95	3	93	
<b>Detroit-Wayne County</b>					28 St. George	84	0	90	0	25 Clark	11	89	10	90	<b>VIRGINIA</b>					
13 Diggs	0	74	0	77	36 Taber	89	11	93	7	21 Dent	5	89	3	93	4 Abbitt	95	5	97	3	
15 Dingell	5	95	3	93	31 Taylor	11	11	33	7	11 Flood	16	84	20	80	1 Downing	95	5	97	3	
17 Griffiths	5	79	10	77	1 Wainwright	79	11	67	17	30 Holland	11	89	7	93	3 Gary	100	0	100	0	
16 Lesinski	0	95	7	87	38 Weiss	84	0	73	10	28 Moorhead	11	89	10	90	2 Hardy	95	0	87	7	
1 Machrowicz	11	89	10	90	29 Wharton	100	0	97	0	26 Morgan	16	74	10	83	7 Harrison	79	0	87	0	
14 Rabaut	5	89	10	70	<b>New York City</b>					10 Prokop	5	89	3	93	9 Jennings	47	53	57	43	
<b>MINNESOTA</b>					8 Anfuso	5	63	3	70	19 Quigley	0	84	3	87	8 Smith	95	0	97	0	
8 Blatnik	5	79	7	83	24 Buckley	5	0	3	23	14 Rhodes	0	89	0	93	5 Tuck	89	0	93	0	
4 Karth	0	100	0	100	11 Celler	5	63	3	73	15 Walter	11	26	20	40	10 Broybill	95	5	97	3	
6 Marshall	16	32	23	43	7 Delaney	5	89	3	93	17 Schneebeli	75* 25*	-	-	-	6 Poff	95	5	97	3	
3 Wier	0	100	0	100	23 Gilbert	0* 28*	-	-	-	29 Corbett	16	84	23	70	<b>WASHINGTON</b>					
7 Andersen	74	26	83	17	19 Farbstain	0	84	0	87	8 Curtin	32	68	40	53	7 Magnuson	5	95	10	90	
1 Quie	63	37	77	23	22 Healey	11	74	7	80	9 Dague	42	58	60	37	5 Horaa	95	5	93	3	
5 Judd	37	47	57	33	6 Holtzman	5	89	3	93	12 Fenton	21	79	47	53	3 Vacancy					
9 Langen	95	5	97	3	10 Kelly	0	68	3	77	27 Fulton	16	84	27	73	4 May	95	0	90	3	
2 Nelsen	100	0	97	0	9 Keogh	16	63	10	70	23 Gavin	32	47	57	30	1 Pelly	100	0	97	3	
<b>MISSISSIPPI</b>					13 Multer	0	89	3	87	24 Kearns	32	68	47	53	6 Tollefson	47	32	50	47	
1 Abernethy	95	5	97	3	16 Powell	0	32	0	47	13 Lafore	26	0	53	0	2 Westland	95	5	87	3	
6 Colmer	89	11	93	7	14 Rooney	11	32	10	53	7 Milliken	42	58	63	37	<b>WEST VIRGINIA</b>					
3 Smith	74	26	77	23	18 Santangelo	0	89	3	87	16 Mumma	37	58	57	37	3 Bailey	0	95	3	87	
2 Whitten	79	21	87	13	20 Teller	0	95	0	93	22 Saylor	16	74	13	70	4 Hechler	5	95	17	77	
4 Williams	84	0	90	0	21 Zelenko	5	68	3	77	18 Vacancy					5 Kee	0	95	10	87	
5 Winstead	89	0	93	0	5 Bosch	84	0	90	0	20 Van Zandt	16	84	30	70	6 Slack	5	95	10	90	
<b>MISSOURI</b>					12 Dorn	16	79	27	70	<b>Philadelphia</b>					2 Straggers	11	79	7	87	
5 Bolling	5	95	3	97	25 Fino	11	74	13	73	1 Barrett	5	84	3	90	1 Moore	26	74	37	63	
7 Brown	0	74	7	77	4 Halpern	11	84	17	77	3 Byrne	5	95	3	97	<b>WISCONSIN</b>					
9 Cannon	32	16	50	13	17 Lindsay	21	79	23	77	2 Granahan	5	95	3	87	1 Flynn	0	95	0	97	
8 Canahan	0	11	10	7	15 Ray	89	11	87	13	5 Green	5	84	3	87	9 Johnson	0	100	7	93	
4 Randall	0	100	0	93	<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>					4 Nix	5	84	3	90	2 Kastenmeier	5	89	3	93	
6 Hull	32	63	57	40	9 Alexander	21	11	50	7	6 Toll	0	100	0	100	5 Reuss	5	89	3	90	
10 Jones	47	42	67	27	3 Barden</															

Democrats in this type; Republicans in italics



## Around The Capitol

### UN HEARS KHRUSHCHEV, MACMILLAN, CASTRO, NASSER

The United Nations General Assembly, continuing an historic session attended by world leaders, rounded out its second week with East-West spokesmen at an impasse over the means of bettering international relations. (Weekly Report p. 1612)

Major developments:

Sept. 22 -- White House Press Secretary James C. Hagerty announced that President Eisenhower had met for one hour with President Tito of Yugoslavia "in a cordial atmosphere and the usefulness of the direct exchange of views was recognized by both parties."

Sept. 23 -- Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev addressed the General Assembly and proposed sweeping revisions in the UN structure, including the ousting of Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld and his replacement by a three-man directorate representing the West, socialist states and neutrals. Khrushchev also proposed: adoption of a declaration calling for "immediate" independence for all colonial and trust territories and elimination of "strongholds of colonialism in the shape of possessions and leasehold areas"; moving UN headquarters out of the United States to relieve the U.S. of its "burden"; a three-stage world disarmament program, and another summit conference "within a few months."

Khrushchev said Hammarskjöld was guilty of "partiality" towards the "colonialists and the countries who support the colonialists" in his Congo policy, which he termed "shameful." He also chided President Eisenhower for not mentioning the U-2 spy plane incident when he addressed the UN and said "continuation of such actions, and especially their interpretation by the U.S. President as state policy can at any time plunge mankind into a third World War."

Secretary of State Christian A. Herter told newsmen Khrushchev's speech was "an all-out attack, a real declaration of war against the structure, the personnel and the location of the United Nations." Herter later told a meeting of the Foreign Press Assn. in New York he thought Ghana's President Kwame Nkrumah had "marked himself very definitely as leaning toward the Soviet bloc" when he spoke before the UN that morning. Nkrumah, who had talked with Mr. Eisenhower Sept. 22, issued a statement of "surprise" at Herter's statement, said "he was the last person from whom I would have expected such a remark."

Sept. 24 -- Khrushchev told a news conference unless his plan for revamping the UN was adopted, "we will likewise be unable to solve the disarmament question"; the Cuban government announced in Havana the establishment of diplomatic relations with Communist China, thus becoming the first nation in the Western hemisphere to take such action.

Sept. 26 -- Hammarskjöld, in a statement to the Assembly, said he would continue to maintain the "independence, impartiality, objectivity" of his Congo policy until the UN instructed him to do otherwise. He said "this is a question not of a man but of an institution" and he preferred to see his office "break" on adherence to principle "than drift on the basis of compromise."

Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba, in a UN address: called on the nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America to support Cuba in self-protection against exploitation; accused the U.S. of having "decreed the destruction" of his Government; said Cuba was "seriously considering requesting within the framework of international law that U.S. naval and military forces be withdrawn from the Guantanamo base," and such action would be taken "if this base becomes a threat to our people."

President Eisenhower met in New York with India's Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic, later joined Nehru in issuing a plea for a concerted effort to reach an international disarmament agreement. Mr. Eisenhower also authorized a statement that he applauded Hammarskjöld's speech as reflecting entirely the U.S. position.

Sept. 27 -- Nasser told the UN it should recommend that Mr. Eisenhower and Khrushchev meet to form "guiding rules for a new attempt toward disarmament." He also said his country "believes in the policy of non-alignment and adheres to it as a strict yardstick."

Mr. Eisenhower and British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan met and issued a joint statement stressing the need for "full support" of Hammarskjöld and urging the Assembly to "concentrate on serious, sober and constructive work - notably in the matter of disarmament."

Sept. 28 -- Two additional African nations, Senegal and Mali, gained admission to the Assembly, bringing UN total membership to 98; the Assembly's 21-nation steering committee voted not to put the question of seating Communist China on the 1960 agenda and voted to postpone indefinitely the question of whether to recommend scheduling of debate on the Congo.

Sept. 29 -- Macmillan, addressing the Assembly, asked that it set up a board of technical experts to prepare a report within a reasonably brief period to provide the basis for a calm approach to disarmament. He upheld the UN's Secretary-General, rebuked Russia for distorting world issues through out-worn slogans and expressed hope for another summit meeting. Khrushchev leaped to his feet during the speech to shout, "We are always in favor of controls of disarmament," and thumped his desk in protest at other points.

### EISENHOWER, BENSON TRIPS

Presidential press secretary James C. Hagerty Sept. 24 announced that President Eisenhower would make a nine day trip Oct. 17-25 covering six western and midwestern states and Mexico. Hagerty said the trip "is not a campaign trip" and none of the speeches the President will make would be political. He did not deny the possibility of informal talks in support of the GOP ticket or meetings with Republican leaders along the way.

The White House Sept. 23 said Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson would make a market development and good-will tour of South America Oct. 20 to Nov. 3, at the request of the President. Dates for a similar trip to the Far East after the election Nov. 8 have not been firmed, according to an Agriculture Department spokesman.

## NATION'S ECONOMY

Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson and New York financier Bernard Baruch have expressed divergent views on the state of the Nation's economy.

Anderson Sept. 28 in an address at the annual meeting of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund in Washington said the short and long range view of the economic future of the United States was favorable. He said the Nation's economy had undergone "fundamental readjustments" in 1960 and the way was clear for a long period of growth without inflation.

Baruch Sept. 26 in the Saturday Evening Post said there were "many danger signals flying today" and "many disturbing points of comparison" between the current state of the Nation's economy and the boom of the 1920s. He cited large public and private debts as examples of the danger signals.

In a related development, Newsweek Magazine Sept. 27 said President Eisenhower had received a "secret" report from the Commerce Department which showed the Nation's economy was probably in a mild recession which had been going on for several months.

## TEAMSTER MONITOR CHAIRMAN

Former F.B.I. agent Terence F. McShane of New York Sept. 26 was sworn in as chairman of the Teamsters Union board of monitors. McShane said he would try to end the monitorship and restore full autonomy to the Teamsters within "a matter of months - less than a year." He said he would suggest the court-appointed, three-man board take a pay cut from their rate of \$25 per hour and would make a nation-wide appeal to rank-and-file members to submit "legitimate complaints" for "immediate action."

McShane took office at the conclusion of oral arguments against his appointment by representatives of Teamster President James R. Hoffa before Federal District Judge F. Dickinson Letts, who established the monitors in 1958. Letts said he found in the opposing evidence "no occasion whatever for department from the nomination previously made." Hoffa said he believed "McShane without question is prejudiced", and would challenge the appointment in the U.S. Court of Appeals. (Weekly Report p. 1495)

## DOMINICAN SUGAR QUOTA

The Agriculture Department Sept. 23 made a conditional authorization for entry into the United States in 1960 of 321,857 tons of Dominican Republic sugar. The allotment, assigned to the Republic as a result of the July reduction in the Cuban sugar quota, had been withheld from entry for political reasons since its assignment Aug. 2. The authorization was made with the concurrence of the State Department.

The condition placed on the Dominican shipment was a two-cent entry fee per pound of raw value and an additional warning that the authorization would be reduced if the sugar was not made available promptly enough or in sufficient quantity to meet the Nation's requirements. The Department explained that the entry fee was invoked because "under prevailing circumstances" it was in the "national interest" that the Dominican sugar be bought at prices lower than those currently prevailing in the United States. A Department spokesman said the discount would remove most of the advantage of selling

in the U.S. market which normally pays between two cents and two and a half cents per pound more for its sugar than the world market.

President Eisenhower Aug. 23 asked Congress to give him the authority to take away the Republic's 321,857 ton allotment. He said the assignment of such a "large sugar bonus" would be "seriously embarrassing to the U.S. in the conduct of its foreign relations throughout the hemisphere." Congress, however, Sept. 1 adjourned without taking action on the President's request. (Weekly Report p. 1508)

**RELATED DEVELOPMENT** -- Sept. 26 -- Press reports from Caracas indicated the Venezuelan government would officially protest the Agriculture Department's authorization of the entry of the Dominican sugar as a violation of the Aug. 20 vote by the Organization of the American States to impose diplomatic sanctions on the Dominican government. The State Department Sept. 27 said authorizing the entry of the sugar did not violate the OAS agreement which only called for the suspension of trade in munitions, not "for further economic sanctions." The Department also defended the authorization on the grounds that the two-cent entry fee removed any advantage in selling to the U.S. market.

## SUBMERGED LAND

The Supreme Court Sept. 26 was asked to reconsider its decision limiting the offshore boundaries of Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama to 3½ miles from their shores into the Gulf of Mexico, in a brief submitted by the Attorneys General of 12 states. The brief referred to the Court's May 31 decision which also ruled that Texas and Florida were entitled to submerged lands and resources extending for 10½ miles into the Gulf. (Weekly Report p. 961)

The brief said that the Submerged Lands Act of 1953 which the Court interpreted in its May 31 decision was not "justified by the history of the region" or the constitutional history of the Nation. (1953 Almanac p. 388)

The 12 Attorneys General represented Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah and Virginia. The brief was submitted in support of one filed earlier by Alabama, Louisiana and Mississippi.

## NATURAL GAS RATES

The Federal Power Commission Sept. 28 announced a new method of establishing rates for natural gas which is sold to interstate pipelines by independent producers and at the same time handed down its decision in the Phillips Petroleum Co. rate case which had been pending before the commission almost continuously since 1948.

In the Phillips case, a landmark case in setting gas rates, the FPC granted the company an annual rate increase of about \$5.7 million. The commission arrived at the figure through the traditional producer cost method because the evidence was presented on a cost basis. In handing down its decision the FPC said the better method would be to establish fair prices for the gas itself, based on reasonable financial requirements for the industry, rather than on the expenses of each producer.

The new method for establishing rates announced by the commission, known as area pricing, would involve two different maximum prices within each of approximately 25 gas producing areas. One maximum price would be for new sales in the area and the second for proposed rate increases within the area.



## SOUTHERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

The Chief Executives of 16 Southern and border states, meeting in Hot Springs, Ark. for the 26th annual Southern Governors' Conference, concluded the three-day session Sept. 28 by calling on the Federal Government to stem the influx of low-cost foreign-produced goods which they said threatens the security of many industries in the South and elsewhere in the U.S.

By adopting a resolution urging the Eisenhower Administration to place import quotas on textile products, apparel, menhaden fish and shrimp, the Governors reversed the position they had taken in 1959 when they resisted various protectionist proposals. The resolution adopted by the conference specifically called on the Executive Branch and Congress to:

- Re-examine and reshape U.S. foreign trade policy.
- Establish import quotas on textiles, apparel, menhaden, shrimp and other imported goods which threaten domestic industries.
- Require companies importing foreign-produced petroleum to observe the mandatory oil import program.
- Take executive and legislative action to avoid further trade concessions under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in any import-stricken industry.
- Initiate a Congressional investigation of the reciprocal trade program to determine what laws need to be revised.

The New York Times Sept. 29 described the adoption of the trade resolution as "a significant victory" for lobbyists for the textile and petroleum industries, several of whom, the Times said, "attended the conference in the guise of newsmen." Representatives of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute held a breakfast meeting with some of the governors Sept. 26.

In another resolution which was approved Sept. 28, the governors launched a campaign for a "return of constitutional government." Following an unscheduled address by the chairman of the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government, David Mays, the governors adopted by unanimous consent a resolution which declared: "We are at war at home and abroad, between the ideologies of communism and freedom, and there must be a knowledge and appreciation of the Constitution." Price Daniel (D Texas), who succeeded J. Lindsay Almond Jr. (D Va.) as chairman of the Conference, said the National Governors' Conference would be asked to join the Southern group in urging every public school in the Nation to require a study of the U.S. Constitution and its principles.

Among other resolutions adopted by the Conference was one which recommended that member states take immediate action to participate with the Federal Government in the program providing medical care for the elderly as enacted by Congress in the Social Security Amendments of 1960 (PL 86-778).

Membership in the Southern Governors' Conference includes the governors of Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia and West Virginia.

## NEW IMMIGRATION QUOTAS

President Eisenhower Sept. 24 issued a proclamation establishing annual immigration quotas of 100 each for 13 African states and the Republic of Cyprus; all of the

countries became independent in 1960. The 13 African states are: Cameroun, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Republic of the Congo, Dahomey, Gabon, Ivory Coast, Malgache Republic (formerly Madagascar) Niger, Somali Republic, Togo, and Upper Volta.

## Pressures On Congress

### WATERWAY TOLLS

The National Waterways Conference in Washington Sept. 23 announced plans for a campaign to combat what it called the growing threat of "potentially ruinous" waterway tolls.

The action was agreed on earlier at a meeting in St. Louis of shippers, water resource development groups, trade associations and water carriers belonging to the Conference. Since its formation in 1955, the Waterways Conference has been a loose federation of development and trade associations with the function of coordinating the efforts of individual member groups in opposition to waterway toll proposals. Organizations attending the meeting in St. Louis decided to turn the Conference into an active policy group in order to offset what they viewed as an intensified campaign for a waterways toll. According to Braxton B. Carr, president of the American Waterways Operators and chairman of the Conference, the toll campaign has reached "critical" proportions because of the following three developments: (1) the introduction in Congress of legislation (S 3608) to fix user-charges on inland water carriers of about two mills per ton-mile; (2) a proposal by a member of a transportation study group set up by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for a two-mill user-charge; (3) the recommendation by the Commerce Department March 14, 1960 that carriers on inland waterways should be subject to a fuel tax increase. (Weekly Report p. 440)

The Waterways Conference contended that the imposition of waterways tolls would be inflationary, would disrupt industries which depended on water transportation and would curtail the development of water resources and services. The Conference noted that navigable waterways have been tax-free since 1787.

Carr said the foremost proponents of waterway tolls were railroad interests.

### RAILROADS' POSITION

When contacted by Congressional Quarterly Sept. 28, a spokesman for the Association of American Railroads said tolls or user-charges should be required of inland water carriers in return for appropriations from the Federal Government which are used to develop and improve waterways and harbors. The AAR also contended that other forms of transportation which do pay taxes were placed at a competitive disadvantage in relation to the water carriers.

A third reason for waterway tolls, as cited by the railroad spokesman, was the fact that the principal users and beneficiaries of a tax-free waterway system were private corporations which maintain their own barge lines. "The assumption that waterways are a medium of public use is completely fallacious," the AAR said.





## LOBBIES HAD MIXED SUCCESS IN 1960 SESSION

The 1960 Congressional session was a frustrating one for many of the big Washington lobby groups. Labor, in particular, was all but shut out in its legislative accomplishments. The AFL-CIO, United Mine Workers and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, for example, worked in vain for passage of legislation to finance a program of health benefits for the aged through the Social Security System. The unions, along with the National Education Assn., also were thwarted in their efforts on behalf of a school-aid bill. Minimum wage legislation, a primary legislative goal of organized labor, also failed to gain Congress' approval.

On the other hand, some lobbies representing business were grateful for Congress' unwillingness to enact the labor-backed legislation, but they failed to gain approval for many of their own proposals. For example, the self-employed retirement bill (HR 10) died in the 1960 session. It was supported by virtually every major business organization.

Following is a roundup of how lobbies fared in 1960 and their probable objectives in 1961. Organizations are listed under the subjects which enlisted most of their legislative activity but this does not mean that they did not have other interests.

### Business

**AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN.** (representing approximately 17,000 bankers and bank administrators) -- In a newsletter to member banks, Ben. C. Corlett, senior vice president of ABA, said: "Banking legislation did fare extremely well in the 86th Congress...." Two of the three primary legislative objectives of the ABA were enacted by Congress in 1960. They were: (1) a bill (S 1062 -- PL 86-463) providing for federal regulation of bank mergers and (2) a bill (HR 12465 -- PL 86-671) providing for simpler methods of determining assessments under Federal Deposit Insurance Act. The only bill considered as a primary legislative objective by the ABA and not enacted into law was a measure (HR 7950) providing equal tax treatment for commercial banks and mutual financial institutions.

The ABA also backed a bill (HR 10) that would have permitted self-employed persons to defer payment of income taxes on income set aside for retirement purposes. After being passed by the House, HR 10 was debated briefly in the Senate but was dropped in the adjournment rush.

● According to the ABA newsletter, "Equitable tax treatment among financial institutions is by far the most important task facing us in the 87th Congress." An ABA spokesman Sept. 22 said the bankers also were very hopeful of enactment of a self-employed retirement bill in 1961.

**AMERICAN RETAIL FEDERATION** (representing 70 state and national retail associations with a total membership of 800,000) -- A Federation spokesman said the

ARF was "happy" that Congress did not enact the minimum wage bill (HR 12677) which would have raised the \$1.00-per-hour federal minimum wage and increased the number of workers covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act. The ARF also opposed the common site picketing bill (S 2643) that would have exempted building trades unions picketing a joint construction site from certain Taft-Hartley prohibitions against secondary boycotts. Minimum wage legislation was passed by both the House and Senate but died in conference; the common site picketing bill failed to get out of committee.

A third bill opposed by the ARF and which also died in committee was the Douglas credit-labelling bill (S 2755). As introduced by Sen. Paul H. Douglas (D Ill.), S 2755 would have required merchants and money lenders to provide potential customers with full knowledge of finance charges in advance of loans and installment purchases.

The ARF supported in part the self-employed retirement bill (HR 10) which died in the August session of Congress.

● In 1961 the Federation will oppose a credit-labelling bill which it said is certain to be reintroduced. It also will press for a modified version of the self-employed retirement bill.

**CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S.** (representing 3,400 local and state chambers of commerce) -- The general legislative goals of the Chamber in 1960 were to keep the federal budget in balance, to hold government spending to a minimum and to prevent further centralization of governmental powers. It was successful in opposing legislation that would have provided federal money for school construction and teachers' salaries (S 8, HR 10128); made federal grants, loans and technical assistance available to chronically depressed labor-surplus areas; provided minimum federal standards for unemployment compensation; provided a federal health insurance program to be financed through the Social Security system; and provided an increase in the federal minimum wage and expansion of coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Among the Chamber's setbacks were its efforts in behalf of legislation that would have removed the 4.25 percent maximum interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds; increased postal rates by one cent on first class and airmail letters; overturned a 1959 ruling by the Internal Revenue Service that disallowed tax deductions for dues paid to chambers of commerce, trade associations and other groups engaged in lobbying.

● The Chamber expects that most of the bills it opposed in 1960 will come up again in 1961. It will lobby against these and for the same measures it supported in 1960.

**NATIONAL ASSN. OF MANUFACTURERS** (representing 20,300 businesses firms) -- The legislative goals of the NAM, to a large extent, paralleled those of the

Chamber of Commerce. The NAM opposed minimum wage legislation and the social security approach for health care for the aged. It lobbied against the common situs picketing bill and the Douglas credit-labelling bill.

The NAM campaigned unsuccessfully for tax reform legislation (HR 3000, 3001) to reduce corporate and personal income taxes to a maximum of 47 percent (corporate maximum is 52 percent) in five annual installments.

● In 1961 the NAM will continue to press for tax revision.

**NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS** (representing 150,000 small businessmen) -- George J. Burger, vice president, said the NFIB was disappointed Congress did not enact a bill (HR 3176) that would have corrected what he called an "inequity" in the method in which excise taxes are levied on tires. According to Burger, about 3,000 retailers are subject to the tire excise tax at the time their invoices are rendered, whereas more than 2,000 stores operated by the so-called big three tire manufacturers -- Goodyear, Firestone and Goodrich -- are exempt from the excise tax. HR 3176, which would have applied the excise tax to tires and tubes sold in stores operated by the manufacturer, as well as by independent retailers, was reported by the House Ways and Means Committee Aug. 15 but did not get to the House floor.

The Federation also opposed minimum wage legislation and the credit-labelling bill and supported the self-employed retirement bill.

● The NFIB in 1961 will concentrate on passage of a bill similar to HR 3176.

**NATIONAL RETAIL MERCHANTS ASSN.** (representing 11,000 stores) -- John C. Hazen, vice president, said the NRMA considered the Congressional stalemate on minimum wage legislation a victory for the retailers. Another victory, he said, was the fact that the credit labelling bill did not get out of committee. Although the NRMA suffered setbacks in its efforts to repeal the 10 percent excise taxes on furs, luggage, jewelry and cosmetics, Hazen said the 1960 session of Congress was considered successful for the retailers.

● The NRMA will continue to oppose minimum wage legislation in 1961 and will carry on its fight to repeal the excise taxes.

**SOUTHERN STATES INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL** (representing 2,000 business firms in the 16 southern states from Maryland to Texas) -- Legislative objectives of the Council followed closely those of the Chamber of Commerce and the NAM. In addition, the Council was eager to see enacted a so-called states rights bill (S 3, HR 3) which would limit application of the federal preemption doctrine by state or federal courts. Failure of the states rights bill to get out of committee was viewed as a setback for the Council. Considered as a victory by the Council was the \$500-million cut in Mutual Security appropriations (HR 12619).

● Like the Chamber and the NAM, the Council will press for federal economy in 1961 and renew its campaign for enactment of states rights legislation.

## Citizens

**AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION** (representing 45,000 individuals dedicated to "restoring the influence of liberalism") -- A review of the 1960 Congressional session prepared for the September edition of

the ADA World said, "The most predominantly liberal and Democratic Congress since 1936 was barely able to assure the continuance of existing programs, much less respond to new challenges. Every attempt at creative legislative innovation was stifled...."

"At the end, Congress could count among its miniscule achievements only the continuation of the Mutual Security Program, a civil rights bill (HR 8601) which satisfied no major objective of rights advocates and minor improvements in the Social Security system. Among the casualties were medical care for the aged, aid to education, public housing, urban renewal and minimum wage legislation. Congress so effectively throttled itself that depressed areas and water pollution legislation were the only notable victims of a veto during the second session."

● ADA national chairman Samuel H. Beer Sept. 4 called for changes in the rules of the House and Senate in 1961 to prevent "sabotage...of the legislative process" by the "Dixiecrat-Republican coalition." Beer said the rules changes should provide that: (1) Congressional committees are composed mainly of members committed to carry out those portions of their party platforms over which the committee has jurisdiction; (2) Legislation cannot be killed in committee by filibuster or arbitrary action of the chairman; (3) Measures reported by committees actually reach the floor for debate; (4) A majority of the Senate will be able to bring legislation to a vote after a reasonable opportunity to debate; and (5) Lawmakers picked as members of conference committees represent the majority will.

**FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION** (representing most constituent bodies of the religious Society of Friends in the U.S.) -- Senate ratification of the Antarctic Treaty, in the view of the FCNL, may have been "the most significant act taken by Congress in a year dominated by politics and an intensified cold war." Outstanding feature of the Treaty, according to the Committee, was that it "demilitarizes an area larger than the United States and Europe combined and provides for complete and unrestricted inspection."

The FCNL listed these other actions it considered constructive: the appropriation of additional funds for disarmament studies; the creation of the new Disarmament Administration under the State Department; the enactment of legislation (HR 11001 -- PL 86-565) providing for U.S. membership in the International Development Assn.; the inclusion in the Mutual Security Appropriations bill (HR 12619 -- PL 86-704) of funds for the Indus Basin development project between Pakistan and India; the authorization of \$500 million for aid to Latin America; and the inclusion of funds in the Mutual Security Appropriations bill for a study of the advisability of establishing a Point Four Youth Corps.

The Friends Committee lamented the failure of Congress to repeal the Connally amendment to the World Court treaty, to oppose the first use by the U.S. of germ and gas weapons, to approve "adequate" civil rights or refugee legislation, or to abolish the mandatory death penalty for first degree murder in the District of Columbia.

● The FCNL in 1961 will continue to push for further progress in disarmament and international relations.

**NATIONAL ASSN. FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE** (representing about 350,000 individuals interested in civil rights) -- According to the

director of the NAACP's Washington office, Clarence Mitchell: "Pussyfooting and surrender in a real fight are suitable epitaphs for the 86th Congress. In the field of civil rights, bold leadership was conspicuously absent in both parties.... The law that was finally passed (HR 8601 -- PL 86-449) is a useful statute, but it falls far short of what is needed in this critical period."

- In 1961 the NAACP will renew its efforts for stronger civil rights legislation.

## Education

**AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION** (representing 140 national and regional organizations and 1,055 institutions of higher learning) -- The Council saw one of its major legislative objectives enacted when Congress gave final approval Aug. 31 to a "stop-gap" housing bill which included a \$500 million authorization for the federal college loan fund for construction of dormitories. It failed to get Congress to pass a new \$250 million loan program for the construction of academic (non-revenue) facilities.

- In 1961 the Council probably will press for a classroom construction loan program.

**NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN.** (representing 664,000 teachers and school administrators) -- Again in 1960 the NEA was thwarted in its efforts to get passage of a massive school-aid program. Its primary legislative objective was a bill (S 2, HR 22) that would have ultimately provided \$4.4 billion a year to build schools and raise teachers' salaries. The House May 26 passed a bill (HR 10128) providing \$1.3 billion over four years for public school construction and the Senate Feb. 4 passed a bill (S 8) authorizing about \$1.8 billion over two years for construction and teachers' salaries. A possible compromise between the two measures was precluded when the House Rules Committee refused to permit a Senate-House conference on education legislation.

"Failure to enact a school support bill was a tragedy for the entire Nation," William G. Carr, executive secretary of the NEA said after Congress adjourned Sept. 1. Criticizing the House Rules Committee, he said majorities in both Chambers favored increased federal support of schools. "It is now clear that an even larger majority must exist before the Congress will act," Carr said.

- The NEA will renew its campaign to get a liberal school-aid bill through Congress in 1961. Carr also implied that the NEA would join with the ADA and other groups in an effort to change Congressional rules.

## Farm

**AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION** (representing 1.6 million farm families) -- The largest of the farm organizations in 1960 concentrated on enactment of legislation to control the Nation's primary surplus commodity -- wheat. Its recommendations conformed generally to the proposals laid down by Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson. The Farm Bureau's four-point wheat policy as outlined in S 3336 and HR 10666 would have (1) eliminated wheat acreage allotments and marketing quotas; (2) based wheat price supports on the support level for corn with adjustments for differences in weight, nutritive value and buyer preference; (3) restricted sales of wheat stocks held by the Government

to protect farmers against competition from surplus Government stocks; and (4) expanded the conservation reserve program (soil bank) to 60 million acres from the current level of 28 million acres.

The Senate Agriculture Committee April 26 rejected the Farm Bureau's wheat plan and April 27 approved a measure (S 2759) which cut national wheat acreage by 20 percent, set wheat price supports at 80 percent of parity and authorized "payments-in-kind" from Government-owned wheat stocks to farmers agreeing to the 20 percent acreage-cutback. The Senate passed the Committee bill June 9 after raising price supports from 75 to 80 percent of parity. In the meantime, the House Agriculture Committee May 18 had approved a bill HR 12261 giving producers a choice between two production control plans. The first would have raised wheat price supports to 85 percent of parity, cut national wheat acreage by 25 percent and authorized payments-in-kind slightly more liberal than the Senate bill. The alternative plan embodied the Farm Bureau proposals -- elimination of all Government controls, a cut in price supports to about 60 percent of parity in 1961 and to 50 percent of parity thereafter and extension and expansion of the conservation reserve to 60 million acres.

HR 12261, which was introduced by Rep. W.R. Poage (D Texas), also provided a national "stabilization" program for feed grains (corn, barley, grain sorghum, oats and rye).

During the House debate on the Poage bill June 23, an attempt was made to strike out everything in the bill except the Farm Bureau wheat plan. The House shouted this down and went on to reject the Poage bill by a 171-236 roll-call vote. By failing to pass a wheat bill of its own and by its rejection of the Senate-passed bill, the House ended any chance for new legislation to deal with the wheat surplus problem. This meant the existing program would remain in effect for the 1961 wheat crop with price supports at 75 percent of parity or about \$1.77 per bushel.

Although the Farm Bureau was unsuccessful in pushing its wheat proposals, it listed these legislative accomplishments:

Enactment of tobacco legislation (HR 9664 -- PL 86-389) maintaining 1960 support prices at the 1959 level and providing that prices in subsequent years be adjusted from the 1959 level in direct proportion to changes in prices paid by farmers for commodities purchased, using the previous three-year average as a base.

Enactment of legislation (HR 12115 -- PL 86-566) providing that the 1961 minimum national acreage allotment for extra long staple cotton be the same as in 1960.

Defeat of HR 12261, the Poage bill, in the House. The AFBF's major setback in 1960, aside from the defeat of its wheat plan, was the enactment of a bill (S 2917 -- PL 86-799) raising Government price supports on milk used in manufacturing and on butterfat.

**NATIONAL FARMERS UNION** (representing 300,000 farm families) -- The NFU supported a wheat bill in testimony before the House Agriculture Committee March 9. As jointly developed by the Farmers Union, the National Grange and the National Assn. of Wheat Growers and subsequently introduced by eight Democrats and four Republicans (HR 11011-11022), the plan would establish a national wheat quota which in 1961 would be about 950 million acres -- 500 million for U.S. consumption, 450 million for export. Farmers would be permitted to



produce 150 million bushels less than the national figure. The 150 million bushel deficit would be taken from the Government's surplus stockpiles. No wheat could be marketed without "use" certificates. To qualify for use certificates, farmers would be required to cut 10 percent from their normal wheat acreage and conform to their production quotas. All certificated wheat would be supported at 75 percent of parity.

The Farmers Union also supported the formula for controlling the production of wheat and feed grains as outlined in the Poage bill.

Among the measures backed by the NFU which were enacted by Congress were the milk and butterfat price support bill; the tobacco price support bill; and extension of the school milk program (HR 9331 -- PL 86-446).

NATIONAL GRANGE (representing 860,000 individuals) -- The Grange, which, along with the Farmers Union and the National Assn. of Wheat Growers, developed the wheat certificate plan, said it was "tragic" that the plan did not get out of committee. The Grange said its accomplishments in the 1960 Congressional session were "practically nil."

## Federal-City Relations

AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSN. (representing 13,000 municipal governments) -- Patrick Healy Jr., executive director, said the House and Senate in 1960 "indicated an awareness of urban needs and enacted legislation along those lines as far as they could go without running into the House Rules Committee or a Presidential veto." Viewed as legislative victories for the AMA were two items in an appropriations bill (HR 11390 -- PL 86-703) for which Congress provided more money than the Administration requested: For grants for the construction of waste treatment plants, Congress appropriated \$45 million; the Administration had recommended \$20 million and had recommended the program be terminated. For hospital construction grants, Congress appropriated \$186.2 million; the Administration had recommended \$126.2 million.

Presidential vetoes stopped two measures high on AMA's priority list: (1) the Area Redevelopment bill (S 722) which would have provided loans, grants and technical aid to urban and rural areas suffering chronic unemployment and (2) a bill (HR 3610) which would have increased grants to communities for the construction of sewage treatment plants. Pigeonholed in the House Rules Committee at session's end was another measure considered important by the AMA: the proposed Housing Act of 1960 (HR 12603) which would have provided an additional \$450 million in urban renewal grant authorizations, increased aid for families and businesses in need of relocation assistance and broadened provisions for the conservation of housing.

Two more measures championed by the AMA never reached the House floor: (1) A Senate-passed bill (S 910) which would have provided for payments to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain federal real property and (2) a Senate-passed bill (S 3278) which would have provided mass transportation assistance to communities by making matching grants to plan local transportation and by making \$100 million available for low-interest, long-term loans to finance the acquisition, construction and

improvement of facilities and equipment for use in mass transit systems in metropolitan areas.

● Among the AMA's legislative objectives in 1961, top priority will go to getting increased authorizations for urban renewal grants.

HOME RULE COMMITTEE OF WASHINGTON, D.C. -- Proponents of local self-government for the District of Columbia failed to get the Senate-passed home rule bill (S 1686) out of the hostile House District Committee. The Home Rule Committee reported that at one time as many as 205 Members of the House had signed the discharge petition that would have freed the measure for House debate. The signatures of a majority of the House -- 219 Members -- were needed to force action on the Home Rule bill.

● For 1961, the Home Rule Committee said it would follow the same plan of action. It hoped that the Senate would pass a self-government bill first and then it would concentrate on lining up support in the House. A spokesman for the Committee said the District of Columbia should have a "larger core of friends" in the 87th Congress.

U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS (representing the Mayors of larger U.S. cities and most others over 30,000 population) -- According to a spokesman for the Mayors Conference, the second session of the 86th Congress "failed to act on many items of importance to cities." He ascribed Congress' failure to act on the needs of cities to the rules of the House and Senate which weighted the power of leadership in favor of the rural areas of the country. The spokesman for the Mayors expressed disappointment that Congress had not provided more money for urban renewal, slum clearance grants and public housing. Two other legislative objectives of the Conference, the depressed areas bill (S 722) and the water pollution bill (S 3610), were stopped by Presidential vetoes.

● "A first item of business in the next session of Congress," the Conference's Legislative Digest declared, "will be to revamp the rules of both the House and Senate so as to permit majority rule."

## Housing

NATIONAL ASSN. OF HOME BUILDERS (representing 40,000 home builders) -- "The home builders ended the 1960 session with a considerable measure of satisfaction and success," according to spokesman for the NAHB. "A major piece of legislation which would have been highly inimicable to the NAHB was not enacted -- the common situs picketing bill (S 2643)."

Also of importance to the NAHB was the enactment of a bill (HR 7903 -- PL 86-665) extending the veterans' direct and guaranteed home-loan program for an additional two years. The "frosting on the cake," said the NAHB spokesman, was the passage of stop-gap housing resolution (H J Res 784) just before the end of the session. The three-point measure extended the Federal Housing Administration's home-improvement loan program for a year, authorized an additional \$500 million for the college housing loan program and an additional \$50 million for the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration.

● In 1951 the NAHB will press for enactment of a so-called central mortgage bank bill which would permit the

Federal National Mortgage Assn. to make short-term "warehousing" loans on the security of FHA and VA mortgages and to authorize FNMA to charter "federal mortgage investment companies" in local communities.

**NATIONAL ASSN. OF REAL ESTATE BOARDS** (representing 60,000 realtors) -- The NAREB counted among its legislative achievements the enactment of legislation (HR 10960 -- PL 86-779), part of which contained the so-called real estate investment trust proposal. The NAREB had been lobbying for such legislation since 1956. As signed into law, the investment trust provision of HR 10960 amended the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the corporate income tax those real estate investment trusts having 100 or more shareholders and which distribute at least 90 percent of their income to shareholders annually. Another part of HR 10960 which was backed by the realtors was the section dealing with the tax treatment of stock in the Federal National Mortgage Assn. As enacted, this measure permitted the purchaser of FNMA common stock to take as a business tax deduction the difference between the par price, which must be paid at the time of purchase, and the quoted market value, which usually is substantially less than par. Under the new legislation, the purchaser of the stock would not have to dispose of it in order to take the deduction.

● Like the NAHB, the NAREB supported the central mortgage bank bill and will continue to press for its enactment in 1961.

**NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE** (representing 3,000 individuals interested in housing) -- Frank Servaites, executive vice president, listed these legislative objectives of the NHC in 1960: an enlarged and expanded urban renewal program; continuance and expansion of low-rent public housing program to permit long-range planning; an enlarged cooperative housing program; increased FHA mortgage-insurance authorization; and the creation of a Department of Urban Development. Servaites said the Conference was thwarted in most of its lobbying efforts during the 1960 session.

He noted the passage of the stop-gap housing resolution but said it fell far short of meeting current problems in the housing field.

● The NHC will again campaign for a "complete omnibus housing bill."

## Labor

**AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR-CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS** (representing 13 million workers) -- The AFL-CIO, with a host of legislative goals in the field of general welfare, considered the 1960 Congressional session a dismal failure. According to one union spokesman: "Every major piece of legislation has failed of enactment." He listed the school-aid bill, minimum wage legislation, health benefits for the aged through the Social Security system, an omnibus housing bill, legislation establishing federal standards for unemployment compensation, the vetoed area redevelopment bill and a strong civil rights measure.

● In 1961, along with stepped-up efforts for the same legislation it supported unsuccessfully in 1960, the AFL-CIO will press hard for changes in the rules of the House and Senate.

**GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' COUNCIL** (representing 24 federal employee unions affiliated with the AFL-CIO) -- GEC unionists have "good reason to be proud" of the legislative accomplishments of the GEC during 1960, said operations director James K. Langan. "Federal and postal employees have benefitted as much from the 86th Congress as any previous session," he said.

The biggest victory for the GEC in 1960 was the enactment over the President's veto of a bill (HR 9883 -- PL 86-568) providing a 7.5 percent to 8.7 percent salary increase for better than half a million postal and white collar Government workers. It was only the second time in President Eisenhower's eight-year administration that Congress had mustered the two-thirds majority in both Chambers that is necessary to override a veto.

● In 1961 the GEC will press for amendment of the Hatch Act to permit wider participation by federal employees in political activities and to lighten the punitive provisions for employees guilty of violating the Act.

**INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOUSEMEN AND HELPERS OF AMERICA** (representing 1.5 million workers) -- The principal goal of the Teamsters Union in 1960 was the enactment of a series of amendments to the Landrum-Griffin bill of 1959. Sidney Zagri, director of the Teamsters' department of legislation and political education, said action on Teamster-supported amendments to the Landrum-Griffin bill was blocked by the Democratic leadership in Congress for fear that public hearings on the proposed amendments would be "embarrassing" in an election year.

The Teamsters also supported the Social Security approach for providing health care for the aged.

● The Teamsters in 1961 will continue to work for legislation to ease the effects of the Landrum-Griffin bill and to curtail Government regulation of union activities.

**UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA** (representing 200,000 coal miners) -- A UMW spokesman said the 1960 session proved "disappointing...after the tremendous political gains made in the 1958 elections." He said the UMW supported minimum wage legislation, the depressed areas bill and most other measures supported by the AFL-CIO. He also cited three bills affecting the coal industry that received UMW backing: a coal research bill (HR 3375 -- PL 86-599) providing \$3 million for the study of new uses of coal; a measure (H Con Res 661) to establish a special Congressional committee to study the need for a national fuels policy; and a bill (S 743) to bring under the inspection requirements of the Mine Safety Act mines employing less than 15 people. Two of the three measures -- the coal research bill and the mine safety bill -- were enacted; the fuels policy resolution was killed by the House Rules Committee.

● The UMW will continue to support the same general welfare legislation in 1961 that it did in 1960 and will work for enactment of fuels policy legislation.

## Power

**AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSN.** (representing 1,000 publicly owned electric systems) -- Alex Radin, general manager, said the APPA did "reasonably well" with its legislative program in 1960. The Association was "particularly successful," he said, in getting Congress to include in the Public Works appropriation bill (HR



12326 -- PL 86-700) money for the Trinity River project in California, for transmission facilities in Iowa to bring power from the Missouri River basin to municipal utilities and rural cooperatives and for construction on the Upper Colorado River project. Radin noted that money also was appropriated to start the following power projects: the Lower Monumental dam and lock in Washington State, the Green Peter Reservoir in Oregon, the Melton Hill dam in Tennessee and the Paradise steam plant of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

- In 1961 the APPA will continue to oppose legislation that seeks to remove tax exemptions on interest from state and local bonds and on the income of municipally owned utilities.

**NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN.** (representing 930 cooperatives and public power districts who borrow from the Rural Electrification Administration) -- Listed as victories by the NRECA were an increase in funds appropriated to the REA loan fund; and Congress' refusal to raise the interest rate on REA loans. It failed in its efforts to obtain enactment of a bill (HR 8) that would have permitted the evaluation of recreational benefits to justify hydroelectric power projects and to increase the number of Government power projects. It also considered as a setback Congress' refusal to authorize federal funds for the construction of the Burns Creek dam on the Snake River.

- In 1961 the NRECA will concentrate on holding down the interest rate on REA loans and getting action on legislation similar to HR 8. An NRECA spokesman said that House Democratic leaders had promised such legislation would be given priority.

## Professional

**AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSN.** (representing 175,000 doctors) -- The AMA said its lobbying campaign in 1960 was successful. It opposed financing health benefits for the aged through the Social Security system and supported the federal-state matching grant plan that was finally enacted. The AMA also supported legislation to require that drugs carry labels with detailed information on their use.

**AMERICAN NURSES ASSN.** (representing 180,000 professional nurses) -- The ANA campaigned unsuccessfully for legislation providing federal aid to collegiate schools of nursing. It lined up in opposition to the AMA on the issue of health care for the aged, supporting the plan to finance the benefits through an increase in Social Security taxes.

- The nurses in 1961 will renew their efforts to get a program of federal aid for college nursing schools.

## Transportation

**AIR TRANSPORT ASSN. OF AMERICA** (representing 47 certificated air carriers) -- Leo Seybold of ATA's legislative department said the 1960 Congressional session produced no major legislation either adverse to or beneficial to the Air Transport Assn.

- With the law providing federal funds to communities for airport construction due to expire June 30, 1961, Seybold said the ATA will support new legislation to extend the program and to increase the amounts made available for airport-aid. He said the ATA also will oppose proposed legislation that would prohibit the Post

Office Department from transporting any mail unless it carried air mail postage.

**AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE ASSN.** (representing 50 merchant marine companies) -- Among the measures supported by the AMMI and enacted by Congress in 1960 were a bill increasing from 50 to 55 percent the ceiling on Government subsidies for domestic merchant marine shipping (HR 10644 -- PL 86-607); a bill to permit merchant marine operators to spread depreciation and amortization mortgage charges over 25 years instead of 20 years on post-war-built ships (HR 10646 -- PL 86-518); a bill to permit unsubsidized operators of war-built ships, except tankers, to trade them in for more modern war-built vessels in the Government reserve fleet (S 2618 -- PL 86-575); and a bill extending for another year the dual rate contract system under which members of steamship conferences give preferential contracts to firms who agree to use exclusively the shipping services of the conference members (HR 10840 -- PL 86-542).

Opposed by the AMMI in 1960 was a provision of the minimum wage bill which would have brought 100,000 seamen under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

- In 1961 the AMMI will support legislation setting up an international travel office in the Government. It also will oppose any broad changes in the dual rate contract system.

**AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSNS.** (representing 50 state trucking associations and 11 truckers' conferences) -- A spokesman for ATA said there was no major legislation considered by Congress during 1960 affecting the trucking industry.

- The Association in 1961 will oppose efforts to let railroads go into the trucking business.

**ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS** (representing 196 railroads in the U.S., Canada and Mexico) -- Gregory S. Prince, vice president and general counsel, said Congress enacted "practically no legislation having special significance for the railroad industry."

- AAR's legislative program for 1961 has yet to be established, Prince said, but "it is reasonable to assume that the railroads' objectives will remain much the same as they have heretofore been, with emphasis on the need for realization of a greater degree of equality of competitive opportunity to be obtained through equal and impartial treatment of the several forms of transportation."

## Veterans

**AMERICAN LEGION** (representing approximately 3 million veterans of World War I, World War II and Korea) -- The Legion failed to get action on a bill (HR 11045) reopening the National Service Life Insurance program to veterans of World War II and Korea whose policies had expired. The legislation died in the House Rules Committee. It also was disappointed that the Senate did not adopt a resolution (S Res 19) creating a Veterans' Affairs Committee in the Senate.

The Legion did help to block enactment of a bill (S 2929) repealing the disclaimer affidavit in the National Defense Education Act and worked against the resolution (S Res 94) which proposed to repeal the Connally amendment to the World Court treaty.

- In 1961 the Legion will continue to press for legislation to reopen the NSLI program and to set up a veterans' committee in the Senate.

## COMMITTEE CRITICIZES CIVIL DEFENSE PREPARATIONS

The House Government Operations Committee has called for a radical change in the Nation's approach to civil defense, one which would place the emphasis on a federal program for financial aid for the construction of communal fallout shelters rather than on encouraging preparation by each individual for his own protection in the event of a nuclear attack.

A July 1 report by the Committee (H Rept 2069) severely criticized the present policies of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, the civil defense arm of the Executive branch, calling them "rudimentary, decentralized, uneven, often irrelevant" despite growing nuclear threats. The report, prepared by the Military Operations Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Rep. Chet Holifield (D Calif.), said any "effective plan for civil defense" must be based on adequate shelter protection which could be attained only through federal grants and aid for shelter construction.

Instead, the report said, the OCDM had taken the official position that each individual must be prepared to care for himself in the event of a nuclear attack and has encouraged this preparation by issuing a barrage of films, lectures and bulletins while neglecting federal aid. Most of the financing, the OCDM has said, must come from the individual himself, or from state and local governments.

Although the Committee report was highly critical of the administration of OCDM director Leo A. Hoegh, it said he had been required to work in an environment "grossly inadequate to the national need", one lacking in authority and responsibility and "too narrowly circumscribed by national law and policy" to permit adequate performance.

The report, developed from hearings March 28-31, examined the current national shelter policy, post-attack recovery measures and the role of the military in civil defense. It did not recommend legislation or a specific federal program other than to urge stronger federal leadership and more federal financial aid.

A minority report said the "magnitude of the expenditures" required to provide a comprehensive national shelter program did not justify such a program when weighed against the alternative requirements for funds of no less, or perhaps even greater, urgency. The minority views were signed by Reps. George Meader (R Mich.), Florence P. Dwyer (R N.J.), Jessica McC. Weis (R N.Y.), and Robert R. Barry (R N.Y.). Similar views were filed in a separate statement by Rep. Clare E. Hoffman (R Mich.).

The minority report quoted testimony before the subcommittee of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Vice Chief of Staff, who said he favored a "reasonable shelter program". When questioned about spending an estimated \$20 billion for such a program, he said, "...I don't think I would put that much money into holes in the ground to crawl into, that I would rather spend more of it on offensive weapon systems to deter the war in the first place."

The OCDM Sept. 9 announced a nationwide campaign to encourage the construction of home fallout shelters, which, in addition to the OCDM, would be carried out by veterans organizations and other civic groups. The group

planned to form a national organization to work at the community level to educate the public in the necessity of fallout shelters. Hoegh said a series of demonstrations in key cities showing the methods by which shelters could be built into homes would be made on Dec. 7, National Civil Defense Day. The new organization consisted of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Amvets, Catholic War Veterans, Air Force Assn., Reserve Officers Assn., B'nai B'rith, Disabled American Veterans, Regular Veterans Assn. and Military Order of World Wars.

## Background

Basic civil defense legislation is contained in the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 which authorized funds necessary (estimated at \$3.1 billion over a three-year period) to carry out the federal program. This included funds for federal-state matching grants to set up local civil defense programs, training personnel, construction of communal-type shelters, and stock piling and procurement of equipment and supplies. To handle the federal aspect of the program, the law established the Federal Civil Defense Administration. (1950 Almanac p. 458)

From fiscal 1951 through fiscal 1961 Congress appropriated \$622.4 million, approximately 25 percent of the total Administration requests during the same period. An OCDM spokesman Sept. 14 told Congressional Quarterly that Congress had repeatedly turned down requests for funds for the federal civil defense program, particularly those which would have been earmarked for the construction of shelters in federal buildings.

The Committee report said the 1950 law -- enacted before the development of large megaton-yield thermonuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles, and based largely on World War II experiences -- emphasized the responsibility of state and local governments in making civil defense preparations. Passage in 1958 of amendments (PL 85-606) to the basic law placed the civil defense responsibility jointly in the hands of federal, state and local governments, the report said, by directing the Federal Government to provide the necessary direction, and financial aid as authorized to implement the responsibility, but added the amendments were "relatively minor."

In 1958 by separate Executive action, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization was established, combining the activities of the FCDA and the Office of Defense Mobilization, established in 1951 to coordinate the civil defense programs of the various federal agencies.

The March hearings considered three phases of civil defense operations: Federal policy with respect to civilian shelter construction; planning by the OCDM and other federal agencies for recovery and survival operations after a nuclear attack; and civil defense implications of Defense Department plans for the location and "hardening" (decreasing vulnerability against attack by increasing fortification) of intercontinental ballistic missile bases. The hearings were one more in a series conducted by the Military Operations Subcommittee over the past five years.

## National Shelter Policy

The Subcommittee found general agreement throughout the country in the need for adequate shelter protection, but little attempt by the Federal Government to provide it although the OCDM had recognized the need. The report quoted from the testimony of OCDM director Hoegh before the Subcommittee in March when he said "fallout shelters offer the best single nonmilitary defense measure for the protection of the greatest number of people in the event of a nuclear war." The Subcommittee said the atomic era was at least 15 years old and this defense was not yet available, with no immediate prospect that any significant number of people would be able to acquire it. Instead, the report said, the civil defense program for the past decade had been based on the belief that, once the dangers of modern warfare were made known, individual action combined with state and local assistance would develop a civil defense program adequate to the Nation as a whole.

In an attempt to encourage "large-scale private construction of fallout shelters" -- which the OCDM called its National Shelter Policy -- Hoegh in 1958 listed the following projects for the OCDM: Inform the people of the dangers; determine the protection available in major cities; accelerate research on incorporating shelters in existing structures; construct prototype structures with practical peacetime uses; and build fallout shelters in new federal buildings as a demonstration of leadership.

The research of OCDM had been aimed primarily at development of shelters suitable for incorporation in various types of structures, the report said.

As part of the "incentive program" the Federal Government has permitted applicants for Federal Housing or Veterans' Administration insured mortgages to include the cost of shelters in determining the value of the loan. Long-term loans to colleges, made by the Community Facilities Administration, for the construction of various types of buildings also can be used for the construction of shelters under this program. The Subcommittee said this approach had had very little effect, and certainly did not constitute a "positive incentive."

Hoegh told the Subcommittee the OCDM's incentive program would have had more positive results if Congress for fiscal 1960 had appropriated the \$2 million requested by the General Services Administration for the construction of shelters in federal buildings.

## New York Shelter Policy

New York Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller (R) developed a shelter plan for his state, probably the most advanced state plan in the country, subsequent to his work as chairman of the 1959 Governors' Conference Committee on Civil Defense. Rockefeller Aug. 2, 1958 presented to the conference a fallout protection report drafted by a Special Task Force on Protection from Radioactive Fallout which recommended: Each state undertake the education of its citizens in the need for fallout shelter protection and the feasibility of acquiring it; responsible federal, state and local officials encourage self-protection against nuclear attacks; each state survey its fallout protection facilities to determine the degree of shielding protection which they afford; and each state provide for a seat of state government which would be protected from a nuclear attack. (1959 Weekly Report p. 1403)

On Feb. 15, 1960 the New York State Committee on Fallout Protection submitted a report to Rockefeller advocating a protection program for the state centered on the home and family. Under this plan, families would be returned to their homes as soon as possible after an attack and shelters large enough to accommodate 100 persons should be provided in non-residential structures. The New York report estimated that home shelters for everyone in the state would cost between \$50 and \$75 per person while a food supply for two weeks would cost \$25.

Hoegh said the New York plan demonstrated that which could be achieved on the state level without direct federal aid, but the Subcommittee in its report said the failure of the New York State legislature to enact the recommendations merely underscored the fact that states "cannot go it alone in meeting the requirements of civil defense."

## Post-attack Recovery

In a post-attack period, the report said, the surviving population would be "hopelessly disorganized", faced with starvation and lacking the resources to rebuild the economy unless there had been "extensive preparations for recovery operations". The doctrinal textbook for the OCDM and local civil defense officials -- the National Plan for Civil Defense Mobilization -- was described by the report as a "paper plan, not a plan for performance", one detailing who was to do what, but not how.

The report also was highly critical of another aspect of the OCDM's recovery operations, its intention -- as stated by Hoegh during the hearings -- to delay introduction of emergency legislation, which had already been drafted, "until either the attack has hit or extreme tension exists." This, the report said, "essentially characterized the OCDM approach to the extremely important task of pre-attack planning in civil defense," since after an attack has been made it would be "far too late to consider passing legislation". Hoegh had argued it was desirable to wait until the emergency was imminent before passing legislation because the public then would be more highly motivated toward caring for itself.

With regard to stockpiling, the report said the program should be overhauled to place primary emphasis on the accumulation, protection and storage of processed food, medical supplies, repair and construction equipment and other items required for survival.

## The Military and Civil Defense

With few exceptions, the Subcommittee found the military services had done little to coordinate their activities with the Nation's civil defense program or to establish a program of its own, while in some cases the execution of military programs had thwarted the national civil defense program. The report made particular reference to the "hardening" of missile bases which in turn would require more intense bombardment by an enemy in order to de-commission it. This factor, the report said, had had a negative effect on nearby communities which formerly had sought to have missile bases located in the vicinity because of the additional revenue which they brought to the area. Because of the increased hazard involved, the report said, the communities had been discouraging the construction of missile sites in the area, despite these advantages. The "hardening" was not coordinated with nearby communities, the report said.



## PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

**Television Debates** -- The Presidential candidates held the first of four nationally broadcast debates Sept. 26 from Chicago.

Before a television audience estimated at 73,500,000, the candidates addressed themselves to the announced subject of domestic policy after stating the importance of domestic conditions in foreign affairs. They discussed economic policy, federal aid to education, their own experience in leadership, federal health programs, communism as a domestic threat and farm policy among other topics. Remaining debates will be Oct. 7, Oct. 13, and Oct. 21, the last devoted to foreign policy. (For debate text see p. 1647.)

**Johnson Candidacy Upheld** -- District Judge F.B. Davenport Sept. 20 dismissed a suit by three Texans to prohibit Democratic Vice Presidential candidate Lyndon B. Johnson from running simultaneously as a candidate for Vice President and United States Senator, as he is doing under a law passed by the Texas legislature in 1959. The state supreme court Sept. 24 refused to consider a motion which would have forced reconsideration of the suit.

**Ladies' Campaign** -- The style, the price and the Americanism of the clothes worn by the two potential first ladies became a campaign issue when Jacqueline Kennedy, wife of Democratic Presidential nominee John F. Kennedy, Sept. 15 said she had been criticized for spending \$30 thousand a year on Paris clothes. "I couldn't spend that much unless I wore sable underwear," Mrs. Kennedy said. (The New York Times Sept. 11 had said, "Jacqueline Kennedy...spends, together with her mother-in-law, Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy, some \$30 thousand a year in the Paris salons.") Mrs. Kennedy said she bought clothes abroad in a limited number. She said she was "sure" she spent less on her wardrobe than Pat Nixon, wife of the GOP Presidential nominee.

Mrs. Nixon Sept. 15 said, "I don't think it is anyone's business how much I spend on my clothes. I shop like any American woman, mostly in Washington and off the rack." (The same New York Times story quoted Mrs. Nixon saying "I consider it my duty to use American designers.")

Mrs. Kennedy, who is kept from active campaigning by pregnancy, Sept. 16 distributed the first of a weekly newspaper column, "Campaign Wife". (Weekly Report p. 1557)

**Byrnes, Shivers, Back Nixon** -- Former Texas Gov. Allan Shivers (D 1949-57) and former South Carolina Gov. (D 1951-55) and former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes announced their support of Nixon. Shivers led Democrats for Eisenhower movements in Texas in 1952 and 1956 and Byrnes supported Eisenhower in 1952 and an independent ticket for Sen. Harry Byrd (D Va.) in 1956. "The Presidency is not a place for an immature or impetuous man," Byrnes said Sept. 22. Shivers Sept. 24 said many Texas Democrats had told him they could not support the party platform. (Weekly Report p. 1606)

**AP Questions** -- The Associated Press Sept. 26 reported Kennedy's replies to seven questions it had sent to

both candidates. The AP said Nixon's press secretary, Herbert G. Klein, had replied that the Vice President did not have time to answer: "It would be possible to have a staff member turn out perfunctory answers.... Mr. Nixon feels, however, that the requests from the Associated Press with all its member newspapers should be fulfilled only if he himself could honestly turn out the work. Time does not permit this."

**Press Poll** -- Editor and Publisher, a trade magazine for newspapers and advertisers, Sept. 15 said a poll of newspapers showed that as of Sept. 9, 54.1 percent of those responding supported Nixon, 15.6 percent supported Kennedy and 30.3 percent were independent or undecided.

**Georgia Endorsements** -- Georgia's Senators, Herman E. Talmadge and Richard B. Russell, both Democrats who had withheld endorsement from their party's national nominees, Sept. 24 issued separate brief statements that they intended to vote for the Democratic ticket. (Weekly Report p. 1524, 1587)

## CANDIDATES' CALENDAR

(For previous calendar see Weekly Report p. 1607)

## KENNEDY

Sept. 22 -- Iowa campaigning; farm speech at national plowing contest, Sioux Falls, S.D.; Billings, Mont.  
Sept. 23 -- Cheyenne, Casper, Wyo.; Denver, Colo.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Chicago, Ill.  
Sept. 24-26 -- Chicago, Ill. Sept. 25 -- Cleveland, Ohio. Sept. 26 -- Debate with Nixon.  
Sept. 27 -- Ohio campaigning; Erie, Pa.  
Sept. 28 -- Upstate New York campaigning.

## JOHNSON

Sept. 22 -- Kansas City, Mo.; Omaha, Lincoln, Neb.  
Sept. 23 -- Kansas City, Mo.; Garden City, Kan.  
Sept. 24-26 -- LBJ Ranch, Johnson City, Texas.  
Sept. 27 -- Illinois campaigning.  
Sept. 28 -- Indiana campaigning.

## NIXON

Sept. 22 -- Missouri and Illinois campaigning.  
Sept. 23 -- Beloit, Wis.; farm speech at national plowing contest, Sioux Falls, S.D.; Kansas City, Kan.  
Sept. 24 -- Lafayette, La.; Jackson, Miss.  
Sept. 25 -- Washington, D.C.  
Sept. 26 -- Chicago, Ill., for debate with Kennedy.  
Sept. 27 -- Memphis, Tenn.; West Memphis, Ark.; Charleston, W.Va.  
Sept. 28 -- Campaigning in New York City and Long Island.

## LODGE

Sept. 22 -- South Bend, Gary, Ind.  
Sept. 23 -- Indiana and Ohio campaigning.  
Sept. 24 -- New York City; Hartford, Conn.  
Sept. 25 -- Connecticut campaigning.  
Sept. 26 -- Staff work in New York City.  
Sept. 27 -- Kansas City, Mo.  
Sept. 28 -- Texas campaigning.

## CLEMENTS SUIT

The Internal Revenue Service has filed a claim against former Sen. Earle C. Clements (D Ky. 1950-57), now a major campaign advisor to Democratic Vice Presidential candidate Lyndon B. Johnson, for \$291,288 in back income taxes and penalties for allegedly fraudulent returns filed 1948-56. The Internal Revenue Service also charged Clements with diverting \$147 thousand from political contributions to personal uses. The claims came to light when Clements, who is also a former House Member (1945-47) and former Governor (1947-50) Sept. 14 filed a petition with the United States Tax Court denying them. Clements said the U.S. in fact owned him \$2,520 in tax refunds but stated he would not try to disprove the charges because it was up to the service to prove them. (Weekly Report p. 1600)

## 'LAND GRAB' CHARGES

Sen. James E. Murray (D Mont.), chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Sept. 24 said Republican Presidential nominee Richard M. Nixon had pledged his support to "the biggest giveaway" of public lands in U.S. history. Murray based the charge on an article in the Sept. 8 edition of the Arizona Republic, a Phoenix newspaper, which said Nixon had told Sen. Barry Goldwater (R Ariz.) he endorsed legislation which Goldwater planned to introduce in the 87th Congress to give federally-owned lands to western states. Murray said the lands in question held "tremendous fortunes in oil and minerals," and added, "Unfortunately, not all states have good land laws. Private interests who want to acquire public domain land cheap have long advocated this formula of getting the domain into state hands so it can then be acquired privately at little cost."

The news story said Arizona Gov. Paul Fannin (R) Sept. 7 announced Nixon's pledge to support the legislation: "Nixon expressed his endorsement...to Sen. Goldwater who had been asked by Fannin to 'sound out' the Republican Presidential nominee on the subject." The paper quoted Fannin saying the proposed legislation could double or triple Arizona's land revenues. It said Fannin said he had been working with Goldwater and Rep. John J. Rhodes (R Ariz.) for many months on a solution to the problem of federal land ownership in Arizona and plans to contact other Western Governors to enlist their support.

Fannin Sept. 24 confirmed the newspaper story but said he was "amazed anyone would be so narrow in their thinking to bring this up as a political maneuver." Aides of Nixon Sept. 24 said he had no comment on the story.

## MISSOURI CANDIDATES

Missouri Gov. James T. Blair Jr. (D) Sept. 23 appointed Lt. Gov. Edward V. Long (D) to fill the seat of the late Sen. Thomas C. Hennings (D) until a special election Nov. 8. Long Sept. 21 was named the Democratic candidate in the election and will run against Lon Hocker, a St. Louis attorney chosen by the Republicans Sept. 23. (Weekly Report p. 1586)

Long's selection by the Democratic state committee followed intense jockeying among several candidates. Former President Harry S. Truman, of Missouri, Sept. 14 said he did not wish the nomination and gave his backing to Rep. Charles H. Brown (D Mo.). Gov. Blair,

considered the leading candidate for the seat, Sept. 20 withdrew himself from the running, giving as his reasons a desire for party harmony and the wishes of his family. Attorney General John M. Dalton, the Democratic gubernatorial candidate, publicly expressed no preference but was believed to have backed Long. Former Kansas City mayor William B. Kemp and state senator Floyd R. Gibson were also under consideration for the nomination. The final vote of the committee was 30 for Long, 14 for Brown. The St. Louis Post Dispatch in a Sept. 22 editorial said of the selection, "What has happened here is what happens so often in a democracy; the better men knock themselves out and lightning strikes the innocuous compromise."

Long, 52, a Clarksville lawyer, is also a bank president, president of several loan companies and a life insurance company and owns a farm. He has held state and municipal office for nearly 20 years and was re-nominated for Lieutenant Governor over two opponents in the Aug. 2 primary, carrying 110 of 114 counties.

The Republican state committee nominated Hocker by acclamation after assistant secretary of the army and former Rep. Dewey Short (R 1929-31; 1935-57) withdrew, reportedly on learning Hocker had sufficient votes to gain the nomination. Hocker, 50, was an unsuccessful candidate for Governor against Blair in 1956, when he lost by 74,418 votes.

Following his nomination, Hocker charged that Missouri government was dominated by a Democratic state machine headed by Richard R. Nacy, a Jefferson City banker who said that Nacy had engineered the selection of Long. Asked about Nacy Sept. 28 Long said, "I have no comment except that Dick Nacy is an active Democrat.... Dick Nacy is my friend and I want him to continue to be."

## R.I. DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY RESULTS

Rhode Island Democrats held their primary Sept. 28 (for results of Sept. 19 GOP primary see Weekly Report p. 1607):

Governor -- Lt. Gov. John A. Notte Jr. of North Providence defeated secretary of state Armand H. Cote of Pawtucket, 64,676 votes (55.3 percent) to 52,370 (44.7 percent), with 298 of 375 districts reporting.

Senator -- Claiborne deB. Pell, 41, a Newport businessman, won the nomination to replace retiring Sen. Theodore Francis Green (D R.I.). Pell defeated ex-Gov. Dennis J. Roberts (D 1951-59) and former U.S. Attorney General J. Howard McGrath (1949-52). Final, unofficial returns:

Pell	83,184 (61.2 percent)
Roberts	45,196 (33.3 percent)
McGrath	7,525 ( 5.5 percent)

House -- 1st District -- State representative Fernand J. St. Germain of Woonsocket won in a five man field. 2nd District -- Rep. John E. Fogarty was unopposed.

## GALLUP POLL

A Gallup Poll released Sept. 24, just before the Sept. 26 broadcast of the first of four television "debates" between the two Presidential candidates, showed those who preferred or leaned toward GOP nominees Richard M. Nixon and Henry Cabot Lodge totaled 47 percent and those favoring Democrats John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson 46 percent with seven percent undecided.



## Special Report

# COMPLETE TEXT OF FIRST KENNEDY-NIXON DEBATE

Following is the complete text of the Sept. 26 radio and television debate between Vice President Richard M. Nixon and Sen. John F. Kennedy, Republican and Democratic nominees for the Presidency. By mutual consent, this debate, first in a scheduled series of four, was limited to domestic issues. The debate was moderated by Howard K. Smith of the Columbia Broadcasting System. Questioners were Robert Fleming, American Broadcasting Co.; Stuart Novins, CBS; Charles Warren, Mutual Broadcasting System; and Sander Vanocur, National Broadcasting Co.

**SMITH:** Good evening. The television and radio stations of the United States and their affiliated stations are proud to provide facilities for a discussion of issues in the current political campaign by the two major candidates for the Presidency. The candidates need no introduction. The Republican candidate, Vice President Richard M. Nixon, and the Democratic candidate, Senator John F. Kennedy.

According to the rules set by the candidates themselves each man shall make an opening statement of approximately eight minutes duration and a closing statement of approximately three minutes duration. In between the candidates will answer or comment upon answers to questions put by a panel of correspondents. In this, the first discussion in the series of four joint appearances, the subject matter has been agreed will be restricted to internal or domestic American matters. And now for the first opening statement by Senator John F. Kennedy.

**KENNEDY:** Mr. Smith, Mr. Nixon, in the election of 1860, Abraham Lincoln said the question was whether this nation could exist half slave or half free. In the election of 1960 and with the world around us the question is whether the world will exist half slave or half free, whether it will move in the direction of freedom, in the direction of the road that we are taking or whether it will move in the direction of slavery. I think it will depend in great measure upon what we do here in the United States, on the kind of society that we build, on the kind of strength that we maintain. We discuss tonight domestic issues but I would not want there to be any implication to be given that this does not involve directly our struggle with Mr. Khrushchev for survival.

Mr. Khrushchev is in New York and he maintains the Communist offensive throughout the world because of the productive power of the Soviet Union itself. The Chinese Communists have always had a large population but they are important and dangerous now because they are mounting a major effort within their own country. The kind of country we have here, the kind of society we have, the kind of strength we build in the United States will be the defense of freedom. If we do well here, if we meet our obligations, if we are moving ahead, then I think freedom will be secure around the world. If we fail, then freedom fails.

### AMERICA'S STRENGTH

Therefore I think the question before the American people is, are we doing as much as we can do. Are we as strong as we should be? Are we as strong as we must be if we are going to maintain our independence and if we are going to maintain and hold out the hand of friendship to those who look to us for assistance, to those who look to us for survival.

I should make it very clear that I do not think we are doing enough, that I am not satisfied as an American with the progress that we are making. This is a great country but I think it could be a more powerful country.

I am not satisfied to have fifty percent of our steel mill capacity unused. I am not satisfied when the United States had last year the lowest rate of economic growth of any major industrialized society in the world because economic growth means strength and vitality, it means we are able to sustain our defenses, it means we are able to meet our commitments abroad.

I am not satisfied when we have over \$9 billion worth of food, some of it rotting, even though there is a hungry world and even though four million Americans wait every month for a food package from the government which averages five cents a day per individual.

I saw cases in West Virginia, here in the United States, where children took home part of their school lunch in order to

feed their families. Because of this I don't think we are meeting our obligations towards these Americans. I am not satisfied when the Soviet Union is turning out twice as many scientists and engineers as we are. I am not satisfied when many of our teachers are inadequately paid or when our children go to school part time shifts. I think we should have an educational system second to none.

I am not satisfied when I see men like Jimmy Hoffa, in charge of the largest union in the United States, still free. I am not satisfied when we are failing to develop the natural resources of the United States to the fullest.

Here is the United States which developed the Tennessee Valley and which built the Grand Coulee and the other dams in the northwest United States. At the present rate of hydro power production, and that is the hall mark of an industrialized society, the Soviet Union by 1975 will be producing more power than we are. These are all the things I think in this country that can make our society strong or can mean that it stands still. I am not satisfied until every American enjoys his full Constitutional rights.

If a Negro baby is born, and this is true also of Puerto Ricans and Mexicans in some of our cities, he has about one half as much chance to get through high school as a white baby. He has one third as much chance to get through college as a white student. He has about a third as much chance to be a professional man, about half as much chance to own a house. He has about four times as much chance that he will be out of work in his life as the white baby. I think we can do better. I don't want the talents of any American to go to waste.

### SOCIAL LEGISLATION

I know that there are those who say that we want to turn everything over to the Government. I don't at all. I want the individuals to meet their responsibilities and I want the states to meet their responsibilities but I think there is also a national responsibility. The argument has been used against every piece of social legislation in the last 25 years. The people of the United States individually could not have developed the Tennessee Valley. Collectively they could have. A cotton farmer in Georgia or a peanut farmer, or a dairy farmer in Wisconsin or Minnesota, he cannot protect himself against the forces of supply and demand in the market place but working together in effective governmental programs he can do so.

Seventeen million Americans who live over 65 on an average Social Security check of about \$78.00 a month, they are not able to sustain themselves individually but they can sustain themselves through the Social Security system.

I don't believe in big government, but I believe in effective governmental action. And I think that is the only way that the United States is going to maintain its freedom. It is the only way we are going to move ahead. I think we can do a better job. I think we are going to have to do a better job if we are going to meet the responsibilities which time and events have placed upon us. We cannot turn the job over to anyone else.

If the United States fails, then the whole cause of freedom fails and I think it depends in great measure on what we do here in this country.

The reason Franklin Roosevelt was a good neighbor in Latin America was because he was a good neighbor in the United States, because they felt that American society was moving again. I want us to recapture that image. I want people in Latin America and Africa and Asia to start to look to America to see how we are doing things, to wonder what the President of the United States is doing and not to look at Khrushchev or look at the Chinese Communists. That is the obligation upon our generation.

In 1933, Franklin Roosevelt said in his inaugural that this generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny. I think our generation of Americans has the same rendezvous. The question now is: can freedom be maintained under the most severe attack it has ever known. I think it can be and I think in the final analysis it depends upon what we do here. I think it is time America started moving again.

SMITH: And now the opening statement by Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

NIXON: Mr. Smith, Senator Kennedy. The things that Senator Kennedy has said, many of us can agree with. There is no question but that we cannot discuss our internal affairs in the United States without recognizing that they have a tremendous bearing on our international position. There is no question but that this nation cannot stand still because we are in a deadly competition, a competition not only with the men in the Kremlin, but the men in Peking. We are ahead in this competition as Senator Kennedy I think has implied, but when you are in a race the only way to stay ahead is to move ahead. And I subscribe completely to the spirit that Senator Kennedy has expressed tonight, the spirit that the United States should move ahead.

Where then do we disagree? I think we disagree on the implication of his remarks tonight, and on the statements that he has made on many occasions during his campaign to the effect that the United States has been standing still. We heard tonight for example, the statement made that our growth in national product last year was the lowest of any industrial nation in the world. Now, last year, of course, was 1958. That happened to be a recession year, but when we look at the growth of GNP this year, a year of recovery, we find that it is six and nine tenths percent and one of the highest in the world today. More about that later.

Looking, then, to this problem of how the United States should move ahead and where the United States is moving, I think it is well that we take the advice of a very famous campaigner: Let's look at the record. Is the United States standing still? Is it true that this administration, as Senator Kennedy has charged, has been an administration of retreat, of defeat, of stagnation? Is it true that as far as this country is concerned in the field of electric power, in all of the fields that he has mentioned, we have not been moving ahead?

#### EISENHOWER RECORD

Well, we have a comparison that we can make. We have the record of the Truman Administration of seven and one-half years and the seven and one-half years of the Eisenhower Administration. When we compare these two records in the areas that Senator Kennedy has discussed tonight, I think we find that America has been moving ahead.

Let's take the schools. We have built more schools in this seven and one-half years than we have in the previous seven and one-half, for that matter in the previous twenty years.

Let's take hydroelectric power. We have developed more hydroelectric power in these seven and one-half years than was developed in any previous administration in history.

Let us take hospitals. We find more have been built in this administration than in the previous administration. The same is true of highways.

Let us put it in terms that all of us can understand. We often hear gross national product discussed. And in that respect may I say that when we compare the growth in this administration with that of the previous administration that then there was a total growth of 11 percent over seven years. In this administration there has been a total growth of 19 percent over seven years. That shows that there has been more growth in this administration than in its predecessor, but let's not put it there. Let's put it in terms of the average family. What has happened to you?

We find that your wages have gone up five times as much in the Eisenhower Administration as they did in the Truman Administration. What about the prices you pay? We find that the prices you pay went up five times as much in the Truman Administration as they did in the Eisenhower Administration. What is the net result of this? This means that the average family income went up fifteen percent in the Eisenhower years as against two percent in the Truman years. Now, this is not standing still, but good as this record is, may I emphasize it isn't enough. A record is never something to stand on. It is something to build on. And in building on this record I believe that we have the secret for progress; we know the way to progress and I think first of all our own record proves that we know the way.

Senator Kennedy has suggested that he believes he knows the way. I respect the sincerity with which he makes that suggestion but, on the one hand, when we look at the various programs that he offers, they do not seem to be new, they seem to be simply retreads of the programs of the Truman Administration which

preceded it, and I would suggest that during the course of the evening he might indicate those areas in which his programs are new, where they will mean more progress than we had then.

What kind of programs are we for? We are for programs that will expand educational opportunities, that will give to all Americans their equal chance for education, for all of the things which are necessary and dear to the hearts of our people. We are for programs in addition which will see that our medical care for the aged is much better handled than it is at the present time. Here again may I indicate that Senator Kennedy and I are not in disagreement as to the aim. We both want to help the old people. We want to see that they do have adequate medical care. The question is the means. I think that the means that I advocate will reach that goal better than the means that he advocates.

I could give better examples but whatever it is, whether it is in the field of housing -- or health or medical care or schools or the development of electric power, we have programs which we believe will move America, move her forward and build on the wonderful record that we have made over these past seven and a-half years.

Now, when we look at these programs, might I suggest that in evaluating them, we often have a tendency to say that the test of a program is how much you are spending. I will concede that in all the areas to which I have referred, Senator Kennedy would have the Federal Government spend more than I would have it spend. I figured out the cost of the Democratic platform. It runs a minimum of \$13.2 billion a year more than we are presently spending to a maximum of \$18 billion a year more than we are presently spending.

Now, the Republican platform will cost more, too. It will cost a minimum of \$4 billion a year more, a maximum of \$4.9 billion a year more than we are presently spending. Now, does this mean that his program is better than ours? Not at all, because it isn't a question of how much the Federal Government spends, it isn't a question of which Government does the most, it is a question of which administration does the right things and in our case I do believe that our programs will stimulate the creative energies of 180 million free Americans. I believe the programs that Senator Kennedy advocates will have a tendency to stifle those creative energies. I believe, in other words, that his programs would lead to the stagnation of the motive power that we need in this country to get progress.

The final point that I would like to make is this: Senator Kennedy has suggested in his speeches that we lack compassion for the poor, for the old and for others that are unfortunate. Let us understand throughout this campaign that his motives and mine are sincere. I know what it means to be poor. I know what it means to see people who are unemployed. I know Senator Kennedy feels as deeply about these problems as I do but our disagreement is not about the goals for America but only about the means to reach those goals.

SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Nixon.

That completes the opening statements and now the candidates will answer questions or comment upon one another's answers to questions put by correspondents of the networks.

The correspondents.

VANOCUR: I am Sander Vanocur, NBC NEWS.

WARREN: I am Charles Warren, Mutual News.

NOVINS: I am Stuart Novins, CBS News.

FLEMING: Bob Fleming, the ABC News.

SMITH: The first question, to Senator Kennedy, from Mr. Fleming.

#### KENNEDY EXPERIENCE

FLEMING: Senator, the Vice President in his campaign has said that you were naive and at times immature. He has raised the question of leadership. On this issue why do you think people should vote for you rather than the Vice President?

KENNEDY: The Vice President and I came to the Congress together in 1946. We both served on the Labor Committee. I have been there now for 14 years, the same time that he has, so that our experience in government is comparable.

Secondly, I think the question is: what are the programs that we advocate? What is the party record that we lead?

I come out of the Democratic Party which in this century has produced Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman and which supported and sustained these programs which I have discussed tonight.

Mr. Nixon comes out of the Republican Party. He was nominated by it. And it is a fact that through most of these last 25 years the Republican leadership has opposed federal aid for education, medical care for the aged, development of the Tennessee Valley, development of our natural resources. I think Mr. Nixon is an effective leader of his party. I hope he would grant me the same. The question before us is which point of view and which party do we want to lead the United States.

SMITH: Mr. Nixon, would you like to comment on that statement?

NIXON: I have no comment.

#### NIXON PROPOSALS

SMITH: The next question, Mr. Novins.

NOVINS: Mr. Vice President, your campaign stresses the value of your 8-year experience and the question arises as to whether that experience was as an observer or as a participant or as an initiator of policy making. Would you tell us, please, specifically, what major proposals you have made in the last eight years that have been adopted by the administration?

NIXON: It would be rather difficult to cover them in eight -- in two and one half minutes. I would suggest that these proposals could be mentioned: First, after each of my foreign trips, I have made recommendations that have been adopted. For example, after my first trip abroad, I strongly recommended that we increase our exchange programs particularly as they related to exchange of persons, of leaders in the labor field and in the information field. After my trip to South America, I made recommendations that a separate inter-American lending agency be set up which the South American nations would like much better than to participate in the lending agencies which treated all the countries of the world the same.

I have made other recommendations after each of the other trips. For example, after my trip abroad to Hungary, I made some recommendations with regard to the Hungarian refugee situation which were adopted not only by the President but some of them were enacted into law by the Congress.

Within the Administration as Chairman of the President's Committee on Price Stability and Economic Growth, I have had the opportunity to make recommendations which have been adopted within the Administration and which I think have been reasonably effective.

I know Senator Kennedy suggested in his speech at Cleveland that that Committee had not been particularly effective. I would only suggest that while we do not take credit for it, I would not presume to, that since that Committee has been formed, the price line has been held very well within the United States.

KENNEDY: Well, I would say, in the latter, that the -- and that's what I found somewhat unsatisfactory about the figures Mr. Nixon that you used in your previous speech, when you talked about the Truman Administration. Mr. Truman came to office in 1944 and at the end of the war and difficulties that were facing the United States during that period of transition, 1946 when price controls were lifted. So it is rather difficult using an over-all figure, taking those seven and one-half years and comparing them to the last eight years. I prefer to take the over-all percentage record of the last twenty years of the Democrats and the eight years of the Republicans to show an over-all period of growth.

In regard to price stability, I am not aware that that Committee did produce recommendations that ever were certainly before the Congress from the point of view of legislation in regard to controlling prices.

In regard to the exchange of students of labor unions, I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa. I think that one of the most unfortunate phases of our policy towards that country was the very minute number of exchanges that we had.

I think it is true of Latin America also. We did come forward with a program of students for the Congo of over three hundred, which was more than the federal government had for all of Africa the previous year. So that I don't think that we have moved, at least in those two areas, with sufficient vigor.

#### FARM SURPLUSES

SMITH: The next question to Senator Kennedy from Mr. Warren.

WARREN: Senator Kennedy, during your brief speech a few minutes ago, you mentioned farm surpluses.

KENNEDY: That is correct.

WARREN: I would like to ask this. It is a fact, I think, that presidential candidates traditionally make promises to farmers. Lots of people I think don't understand why the government pays farmers for not producing certain crops or paying farmers if they overproduce, for that matter. Let me ask, sir, why can't the farmer operate like the business man who operates a factory? If an auto company overproduces a certain model of car, Uncle Sam doesn't step in and buy up the surplus. Why this constant courting of the farmer?

KENNEDY: Because I think that if the federal government moved out of the program and withdrew its supports, then I think you would have complete economic chaos. The farmer plants in the spring and harvests in the fall. There are hundreds of thousands of them. They really are not able to control their market very well. They bring their crops in or their livestock in, many of them about the same time. They have only a few purchasers that buy their milk or their hogs, a few large companies in many cases, and therefore the farmer is not in a position to bargain very effectively in the market place.

I think the experience of the Twenties has shown what a free market could do to agriculture and if the agricultural economy collapses, then the economy of the rest of the United States sooner or later will collapse. The farmers are the number one market for the automobile industry of the United States. The automobile industry is the number one market for steel, so if the farmers' economy continues to decline as sharply as it has in recent years then I think you would have a recession in the rest of the country. So I think the case for the government intervention is a good one.

Secondly, my objection to present farm policy is that there are no effective controls to bring supply and demand into better balance. The dropping of the support price in order to limit production has not worked and we now have the highest surpluses, \$9 billion worth. We have had a higher tax load from the Treasury for the farmer in the last few years with the lowest farm income in many years. I think that this farm policy has failed.

#### BENSON 'FAILURE'

In my judgment, the only policy that will work will be for effective supply and demand to be in balance, and that can only be done through governmental action. I therefore suggest that in those basic commodities which are supported that the federal government, after endorsement by the farmers in that commodity, attempt to bring supply and demand into balance, attempt effective production controls so that we won't have five or six percent surplus which breaks the price 15 or 20 percent.

I think Mr. Benson's program has failed. And I must say after reading the Vice President's speech before the farmers, as he read mine, I don't believe it is very much different from Mr. Benson's. I don't think it provides effective government controls. I think the support prices are tied to the average market prices for the last three years, which was Mr. Benson's theory. I therefore do not believe that this is a sharp enough breach with the past to give us any hope for success in the future.

SMITH: Mr. Nixon, comment?

NIXON: I of course disagree with Senator Kennedy in so far as his suggestion as to what should be done on the farm program. He has made the suggestion that what we need is to move in the direction of more government controls, a suggestion that would also mean raising prices that the consumers pay for products and imposing upon the farmers controls on acreage even far more than they have today. I think this is the wrong direction. I don't think this has worked in the past. I do not think it will work in the future. The program that I have advocated is one which departs from the present program that we have in this respect. It recognizes that the Government has a responsibility to get the farmer out of the trouble he presently is in because the Government got him into it. And that is the fundamental reason why we can't let the farmer go by himself at the present time. The farmer produced these surpluses because the Government asked him to through legislation during the war. Now that we have these surpluses, it is our responsibility to indemnify the farmer during that period that we get rid of the surpluses.

Until we get the surpluses off the farmers' back, however, we should have a program such as I announced which will see that



farm income holds up. But I would propose holding that income up not through a type of program that Senator Kennedy has suggested that would raise prices but one that would indemnify the farmer, pay the farmer in kind from the products which are in surplus.

## NIXON IDEAS

SMITH: The next question to Vice President Nixon from Mr. Vanocur.

VANOCUR: Mr. Vice President, since the question of executive leadership is a very important campaign issue I would like to follow Mr. Novins' question. Now, Republican campaign slogans, you'll see them on signs around the country as you did last week, say "it is experience that counts." That's over a picture of yourself, sir, implying that you have more governmental, executive decision-making experience than your opponent.

Now in his news conference on August 24, President Eisenhower was asked to give one example of a major idea of yours that he had adopted. His reply was, and I am quoting, "If you give me a week I might think of one. I don't remember." Now that was a month ago, sir, and the President hasn't brought it up since and I am wondering, sir, if you can clarify which version is correct, the one put out by Republican campaign leaders or the one put out by President Eisenhower?

NIXON: Well I would suggest Mr. Vanocur, that if you know the President, that was probably a facetious remark. I would also suggest that insofar as his statement is concerned, that I think it would be improper for the President of the United States to disclose the instances in which members of his official family had made recommendations, as I have made them through the years to him, which he has accepted or rejected.

The President has always maintained and very properly so that he is entitled to get what advice he wants from his cabinet and from his other advisors without disclosing that to anybody, including, as a matter of fact, the Congress.

Now I can only say this: through the years I have sat in the National Security Council, I have been in the Cabinet. I have met with the legislative leaders. I have met with the President when he made the great decisions with regards to Lebanon, Quemoy and Matsui, other matters. The President has asked for my advice. I have given it. Sometimes my advice has been taken. Sometimes it has not.

I do not say that I have made the decisions and I would say that no President should ever allow anybody else to make the major decisions. The President only makes the decisions. All that his advisors do is to give counsel when he asks for it. As far as what experience counts and whether that is experience that counts, that isn't for me to say. I can only say that my experience is there for the people to consider.

Senator Kennedy's is there for people to consider. As he pointed out, we came to the Congress in the same year. His experience has been different from mine. Mine has been in the Executive Branch. His has been in the Legislative Branch. I would say that the people now have the opportunity to evaluate his as against mine and I think both he and I are going to abide by whatever the people decide.

SMITH: Senator Kennedy?

KENNEDY: Well, I will just say that the question is of experience and the question also is of what our judgment is of the future, and what our goals are for the United States, and what ability we have to implement those goals.

Abraham Lincoln came to the Presidency in 1860 after a rather little known session in the House of Representatives, and after being defeated for the Senate in '58, and was a distinguished President.

There are no certain roads to the Presidency. There are no guarantees that if you take one road or another that you will be a successful President. I have been in the Congress for 14 years. I have voted in the last eight years, when the Vice President was presiding over the Senate and meeting his other responsibilities. I have met decisions 800 times on matters which affect not only the domestic security of the United States but as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The question really is which candidate and which party can meet the problems that the United States is going to face in the '60s.

SMITH: The next question to Senator Kennedy from Mr. Novins.

## FEDERAL DEBT

NOVINS: Senator Kennedy, in connection with these problems of the future that you speak of and the program that you enunciated earlier in your direct talk, you call for expanding some of the welfare programs for schools, for teacher salaries, medical care, and so forth, but you also call for reducing the federal debt, and I am wondering how you, if you are President in January, would go about paying the bill for all this.

KENNEDY: I did not advocate reducing the federal debt because I don't believe you are going to be able to reduce the federal debt very much in 1961, '2 or '3, I think we have heavy obligations which affect our security which we are going to have to meet and, therefore, I have never suggested we should be able to retire the debt substantially or even at all in 1961 or '2. No, never --

NOVINS: Senator, I believe in one of your speeches you suggested that reducing the interest rate would help toward reducing the federal --

KENNEDY: No, not reducing the interest - reducing the interest rate. In my judgment, the hard money, tight money policy, fiscal policy of this administration has contributed to the slowdown in our economy which helped bring the recession of '54, which made the recession of '58 rather intense and which has slowed somewhat our economic activity in 1960. What I have talked, however, the kind of programs that I talk about, in my judgment, are fiscally sound. Medical care for the aged I would put under Social Security. The Vice President and I disagree on this. The program, the Javits-Nixon or the Nixon-Javits program would have cost, if fully used, \$600 million by the Government per year and \$600 million by the State. The program which I advocated which failed by five votes in the United States Senate would have put medical care for the aged in Social Security and would have been paid for through the Social Security system and the Social Security tax.

Secondly, I support aid to education and federal aid for teachers' salaries. I think that is a good investment. I think we are going to have to do it, and I think to heap the burden further on the property tax which is already straining many of our communities will provide, will make, insure, in my opinion, that many children will not be adequately educated and many of our teachers not adequately compensated. There is no greater return to an economy or to a society than an educational system second to none.

On the question of the development of natural resources, I would pay as you go in the sense that they would be balanced and the power revenues would bring back sufficient money to finance the projects in the same way as the Tennessee Valley. I believe in the balanced budget and the only conditions under which I would unbalance the budget would be if there was a grave national emergency or a serious recession.

Otherwise, with a steady rate of economic growth, and Mr. Nixon and Mr. Rockefeller in their meeting said a five percent economic growth would bring by 1962 \$10 billion extra in tax revenues, whatever is brought in, I think that we can finance essential programs within a balanced budget if business remains orderly.

SMITH: Mr. Nixon, your comment?

NIXON: I think what Mr. Novins is referring to was not one of Senator Kennedy's speeches, but the Democratic platform which did mention cutting the national debt. I think too that it should be pointed out that of course it is not possible, particularly under the proposals that Senator Kennedy has advocated, either to cut the national debt or to reduce taxes. As a matter of fact it will be necessary to raise taxes. As Senator Kennedy points out that as far as his one proposal is concerned, the one for medical care for the aged, that that would be financed out of Social Security. That however is raising taxes for those who pay Social Security. He points out that he would make pay-as-you-go be the basis for our natural resources development which I also support, incidentally. However, whenever you appropriate money for one of these projects you have to pay now and appropriate the money, and while they eventually do pay out, it doesn't mean that the government doesn't have to put out the money this year. And so I would say that in all these proposals Senator Kennedy has made, they will result in one of two things: Either he has to raise taxes, or he has to unbalance the budget. If he unbalances the budget, that means you have inflation and that will be, of course, a very cruel



blow to the very people, the older people, that we have been talking about.

As far as aid for school construction is concerned, I favor that as Senator Kennedy did in January of this year when he said he favored that rather than aid to teacher salaries. I favor that because I believe that is the best way to aid our schools without running any risk whatever of the Federal Government telling our teachers what to teach.

#### SCHOOL AID

SMITH: The next question to Vice President Nixon from Mr. Warren.

WARREN: Mr. Vice President, you mentioned schools. It was just yesterday I think you asked for a crash program to raise educational standards and this evening you talked about advances in education.

Mr. Vice President, you said, it was back in 1957, that salaries paid to school teachers were nothing short of a national disgrace. Higher salaries for teachers, you added, were important and if the situation wasn't corrected it would lead to a national disaster. Yet you refused to vote in the Senate in order to break a tie vote when that single vote if it had been "Yes" would have granted salary increases to teachers. I wonder if you could explain that, sir?

NIXON: I am awfully glad to get that question because as you know I got into it at the last of my other question and wasn't able to complete the argument.

I think that the reason that I voted against having the Federal Government pay teachers' salaries was probably the very reason that concerned Senator Kennedy when in January of this year in his kick-off press conference he said that he favored aid for school construction but at that time did not feel that there should be aid for teachers' salaries. At least that is the way I read his remarks.

Now why should there be any question about the Federal Government aiding teachers' salaries? Why did Senator Kennedy take that position then? Why do I take it now? We both took it then and I take it now for this reason: We want higher teachers' salaries. We need higher teachers' salaries but we also want our education to be free of federal control.

When the Federal Government gets the power to pay teachers, inevitably in my opinion it will acquire the power to set standards and to tell the teachers what to teach. I think this would be bad for the country. I think it would be bad for the teaching profession. There is another point that should be made. I favor higher salaries for teachers, but as Senator Kennedy said in January of this year in the same press conference, the way that you get higher salaries for teachers is to support school construction which means that all of the local school districts in the various states then have money which is freed to raise the standards for teachers' salaries.

I should also point out this: Once you put the responsibility on the Federal Government for paying a portion of teachers' salaries, your local communities and your states are not going to meet the responsibility as much as they should. I believe, in other words, that we have seen the local communities in the states assuming more of that responsibility. Teachers' salaries, very fortunately, have gone up fifty percent in the last eight years as against only a thirty-four percent rise for other salaries. This is not enough. It should be more, but I do not believe that the way to get more salaries for teachers is to have the Federal Government get in with a massive program.

My objection here is not the cost in dollars. My objection here is the potential cost in controls and eventual freedom for the American people, by giving the Federal Government power over education and that is the greatest power a government can have.

SMITH: Senator Kennedy's comment?

KENNEDY: When the Vice President quotes me in January '60, I did not believe the federal government should pay directly teachers' salaries, but that was not the issue before the Senate in February. The issue before the Senate was that the money would be given to the state. The state then could determine whether the money would be spent for school construction or teachers' salaries. On that question the Vice President and I disagreed. I voted in favor of that proposal and supported it strongly because I think that that provided assistance to our teachers for their salaries without any chance of federal control, and it is on that vote that Mr. Nixon and I disagreed, and his tie vote defeated, his breaking the tie defeated the proposal.

I don't want the Federal Government paying teachers' salaries directly, but if the money will go to the states and the states can then determine whether it shall go for school construction or for teachers' salaries, in my opinion you protect the local authority over the school board and the school committee, and therefore I think that was a sound proposal and that is why I supported it, and I regret that it did not pass.

Secondly, there have been statements made that the Democratic platform would cost a good deal of money and that I am in favor of unbalancing the budget. That is wholly wrong, wholly in error. And it is a fact that in the last eight years the Democratic Congress has reduced the requests for appropriations by over \$10 billion. That is not my view and I think it ought to be stated very clearly on the record. My view is that you can do these programs and they should be carefully drawn within a balanced budget if our economy is moving ahead.

#### AUGUST SESSION

SMITH: The next question to Senator Kennedy from Mr. Vanocur.

VANOCUR: Senator, you have been promising the voters that if you are elected President you will try and push through Congress bills on medical aid to the aged, a comprehensive minimum hourly wage bill, federal aid to education. Now, in the August post-convention session of the Congress, when you at least held up the possibility you could one day be President and when you had overwhelming majorities, especially in the Senate, you could not get action on these bills. Now, how do you feel that you will be able to get them in January if you weren't able to get them in August?

KENNEDY: If I may take the bills, we did pass in the Senate a bill to provide \$1.25 minimum wage. It failed because the House did not pass it and the House failed by 11 votes. I might say two-thirds of the Republicans in the House voted against \$1.25 minimum wage and a majority of the Democrats sustained it. Nearly two-thirds of them voted for the \$1.25. We were threatened by a veto if we passed \$1.25.

It is extremely difficult, with the great power that the President has, to pass any bill when the President is opposed to it. All the President needs to sustain his veto of any bill is one third plus one in either the House or the Senate.

Secondly, we passed a federal aid to education bill in the Senate. It failed to come to the floor of the House of Representatives. It was killed in the Rules Committee and it is a fact in the August session that the four members of the Rules Committee who were Republicans joining with two Democrats voted against sending the aid to education bill to the floor of the House. Four Democrats voted for it. Every Republican on the Rules Committee voted against sending that bill to be considered by the members of the House of Representatives.

Thirdly, on medical care for the aged, this is the same fight that has been going on for 25 years in Social Security. We wanted to tie it to Social Security. We offered an amendment to do so; 44 Democrats voted for it. One Republican voted for it, and we were informed at the time it came to a vote that if it was adopted the President of the United States would veto it. In my judgment, a vigorous Democratic President, supported by a Democratic majority in the House and Senate, can win the support for these programs but if you send a Republican President and a Democratic majority and the threat of a veto hangs over the Congress, in my judgment you will continue what happened in the August session which is a clash of parties and inaction.

SMITH: Mr. Nixon, comment?

NIXON: Obviously, my views are a little different. First of all, I don't see how it is possible for one-third of a body, such as the Republicans have in the House and the Senate, to stop two-thirds if the two-thirds are adequately led.

I would say, too, that when Senator Kennedy refers to the action of the House Rules Committee there are eight Democrats on that committee and four Republicans. It would seem to me again that it was very difficult to blame the four Republicans for the eight Democrats not getting something through that particular committee.

I would say further that to blame the President and his veto power for the inability of the Senator and his colleague to get action in this special session misses the mark.

When the President exercises his veto power, he has to have the people behind him, not just a third of the Congress, because -- let's consider it. If the majority of the members of the Congress felt that these particular proposals were good issues, the majority of those who were Democrats, why didn't they pass them and send them to the President and get a veto and have an issue?

The reason why these particular bills in these various fields that have been mentioned were not passed was not because the President was against them. It was because the people were against them. It was because they were too extreme and I am convinced that the alternate proposals that I have, that the Republicans have in the field of health, in the field of education, in the field of welfare, because they are not extreme, because they will accomplish the end without too great cost in dollars or in freedom, that they could get through the next Congress.

SMITH: The next question to Vice President Nixon from Mr. Fleming.

#### DEMOCRATIC MAJORITIES

FLEMING: Mr. Vice President, do I take it then you believe that you could work better with Democratic majorities in the House and Senate than Senator Kennedy could work with Democratic majorities in the House and Senate?

NIXON: I would say this, that we of course expect to pick up some seats in both the House and Senate. We would hope to control the House, to get a majority in the House in this election; we cannot, of course, control the Senate.

I would say that a President will be able to lead, a President will be able to get his program through to the effect that he has the support of the country, the support of the people. Sometimes we get the opinion that in getting programs through the House or the Senate it is purely a question of legislative finagling and all that sort of thing. It isn't really that. Whenever a majority of the people are for a program, the House and the Senate respond to it. And whether this House and Senate in the next session is Democratic or Republican, if the country will have voted for the candidate for the Presidency and for the proposals that he has made, I believe that you will find that the President, if it were a Republican, as it would be in my case, would be able to get his program through that Congress.

Now, I also say that as far as Senator Kennedy's proposals are concerned, that again the question is not simply one of a Presidential veto stopping programs. You must always remember that a President can't stop anything unless he has the people behind him, and the reason President Eisenhower's vetoes have been sustained, the reason the Congress does not send up bills to him which they think will be vetoed, is because the people and the Congress, the majority of them, know the country is behind the President.

SMITH: Senator Kennedy?

KENNEDY: Well, now, let's look at these bills that the Vice President suggests were too extreme. One was a bill for \$1.25 an hour for anyone who works in a store or company that has a million dollars a year business. I don't think that is extreme at all and yet nearly 2/3 to 3/4 of the Republicans in the House of Representatives voted against that proposal.

Secondly, there was the federal aid to education bill. It was -- because of the defeat of teachers' salaries -- it was not a bill that met in my opinion the needs. The fact of the matter was that it was a bill that was less than you recommended, Mr. Nixon, this morning in your proposal. It was not an extreme bill and yet we could not get one Republican to join. At least I think four of the eight Democrats voted to send it to the Floor of the House, Not one Republican joined with those Democrats who were opposed to it. I don't say that the Democrats are united in their support of the program, but I do say a majority are, and I say a majority of the Republicans are opposed to it.

The third is medical care for the aged which was tied to Social Security and is financed out of Social Security funds. It does not put a deficit on the Treasury. The proposal advanced by you and by Mr. Javits would have cost six hundred millions of dollars. Mr. Rockefeller rejected it in New York. He said he didn't agree with the financing at all. He said it ought to be on Social Security. So these are three programs which are quite moderate. I think it shows the difference between the two parties. One party is ready to move in these programs. The other party gives them lip service.

SMITH: Mr. Warren's question for Senator Kennedy.

WARREN: Senator Kennedy, on another subject: Communism is often described as an ideology or a belief that exists somewhere other than in the United States. Let me ask you, sir. Just how serious a threat to our national security are these Communist subversive activities in the United States today?

KENNEDY: I think they are serious. I think it is a matter that we should continue to give great care and attention to. We should support the laws which the United States has passed in order to protect us from those who would destroy us from within. We should sustain the Department of Justice in its efforts, and the FBI, and we should be continually alert. I think if the United States is maintaining a strong society here in the United States, I think that we can meet any internal threat. The major threat is external and will continue.

SMITH: Mr. Nixon, comment?

NIXON: I agree with Senator Kennedy's appraisal generally in this respect. The question of Communism within the United States has been one that has worried us in the past. It is one that will continue to be a problem for years to come. We have to remember that the Cold War that Mr. Khrushchev is waging and his colleagues are waging is waged all over the world and it is waged right here in the United States. That is why we have to continue to be alert. It is also essential in being alert that we be fair, because by being fair we uphold the very freedoms that the Communists would destroy. We uphold the standards of conduct which they would never follow; and in this connection I think that we must look to the future, having in mind the fact that we fight Communism at home, not only by our laws to deal with Communists, the few who do become Communists and the few who do become fellow travelers, but we also fight Communism at home by moving against those various injustices which exist in our society which the Communists feed upon. And in that connection I again would say that while Senator Kennedy says we are for the status quo, I do believe that he would agree that I am just as sincere in believing that my proposals for federal aid to education, my proposals for health care, are just as sincerely held as his.

The question again is not one of goals. We are for those goals. It is one of means.

#### SCHOOL ISSUE

SMITH: Mr. Vanocur's question for Vice President Nixon.

VANOCUR: Mr. Vice President, in one of your earlier statements you said we've moved ahead, we've built more schools, we've built more hospitals. Now, sir, isn't it true that the building of more schools is a local matter for financing?

Were you claiming that the Eisenhower Administration was responsible for the building of these schools, or is it the local school districts that provide for them?

NIXON: Not at all. As a matter of fact, your question brings out a point that I am very glad to make. Too often in appraising whether we are moving ahead or not, we think only of what the Federal Government is doing. Now, that isn't the test of whether America moves. The test of whether America moves is whether the Federal Government, plus the state government, plus the local government, plus the biggest segment of all, individual enterprise, moves.

We have, for example, a gross national product of approximately \$500 billion. Roughly \$100 billion to \$125 billion of that is the result of government activity. \$400 billion, approximately, is a result of what individuals do. Now, the reason the Eisenhower Administration has moved, the reason that we have had the funds, for example, locally to build the schools, and the hospitals, and the highways, to make the progress that we have, is because this administration has encouraged individual enterprise and it has resulted in the greatest expansion of the private sector of the economy that has ever been witnessed in an eight year period, and that is growth. That is the growth that we are looking for, it is the growth that this administration has supported, and that its policies have stimulated.

SMITH: Senator Kennedy?

KENNEDY: I must say I think the reason that the schools have been constructed is because the local school districts were willing to increase the property taxes to a tremendously high figure, in my opinion, almost to a point of diminishing returns in order to sustain these schools.

Secondly, I think we have a rich country, and I think we have a powerful country. I think what we have to do, however, is have the President and the leadership set before our country exactly what we must do in the next decade, if we are going to maintain our security, in education, in economic growth, in the development of natural resources.

The Soviet Union is making great gains. It isn't enough to compare what might have been done eight years ago or ten years ago or 15 years ago or 20 years ago. I want to compare what we are doing with what our adversaries are doing so that by the year 1970 the United States is ahead in education, in health, in building, in homes, in economic strength. I think that is the big assignment, the big task, the big function of the Federal Government.

SMITH: Can I have the summation time, please? We have completed our questions and our comments and in just a moment we will have the summation time.

ANNOUNCER: This will allow three minutes and twenty seconds for the summation by each candidate.

SMITH: Three minutes and twenty seconds for each candidate. Vice President Nixon, will you make the first summation?

#### NIXON SUMMATION

NIXON: Thank you, Mr. Smith, Senator Kennedy. First of all, I think it is well to put in perspective where we really do stand with regard to the Soviet Union in this whole matter of growth. The Soviet Union has been moving faster than we have, but the reason for that is obvious. They start from a much lower base. Although they have been moving faster in growth than we have, we find, for example, today, that their total gross national product is only forty-four percent of our total gross national product. That is the same percentage that it was twenty years ago. And as far as the absolute gap is concerned we find that the United States is even further ahead than it was twenty years ago.

Is this any reason for complacency? Not at all, because these are determined men, they are fanatical men, and we have to get the very most out of our economy. I agree with Senator Kennedy completely on that score.

Where we disagree is in the means that we would use to get the most out of our economy. I respectfully submit that Senator Kennedy too often would rely too much on the Federal Government on what it would do to solve our problems, to stimulate growth. I believe that when we examine the Democratic platform, when we examine the proposals that he has discussed tonight, when we compare them with the proposals that I have made, that these proposals that he makes would not result in greater growth for this country than would be the case if we followed the programs that I have advocated.

There are many of the points that he has made that I would like to comment upon. The one in the field of health is worth mentioning. Our health program, the one that Senator Javits and other Republican senators as well as I supported, is one that provides for all people over sixty-five who want health insurance the opportunity to have it if they want it. It provides a choice of having either government insurance or private insurance, but it compels nobody to have insurance who does not want it. His program under Social Security would require everybody who had Social Security to take government health insurance whether he wanted it or not and it would not cover several million people who are not covered by Social Security at all. Here is one place where I think that our program does a better job than his.

The other point that I would make is this: This downgrading of how much things cost, I think many of our people will understand better when they look at what happened during the Truman Administration when the government was spending more than it took in. We found savings over a lifetime eaten up by inflation. We found that people who could least afford it, people on retired incomes, people on fixed incomes, we found them unable to meet their bills at the end of the month.

It is essential that a man who is President of this country certainly stand for every program that will mean for growth, and I stand for programs that will mean growth and progress, but it is also essential that he not allow a dollar spent that could be better spent by the people themselves.

#### KENNEDY SUMMATION

SMITH: Senator Kennedy, your conclusion.

KENNEDY: The point was made by Mr. Nixon that the Soviet production is only 44 percent of ours. I must say that 44 percent

in that Soviet country is causing us a good deal of trouble tonight. I want to make sure that it stays in that relationship. I don't want to see the day when it is 60 percent of ours, or 70 and 75 and 80 and 90 percent of ours, with all the force and power that it could bring to bear in order to cause our destruction.

Secondly, the Vice President mentioned medical care for the aged. Our program was an amendment to the Kerr Bill. The Kerr Bill provided assistance to all those who were not on Social Security. I think it is a very clear contrast. In 1935, when the Social Security Act was written, 94 out of 95 Republicans voted against it. Mr. Landon ran in 1936 to repeal it. In August of 1960, when we tried to get it again, this time for medical care, we received the support of one Republican in the Senate on this occasion.

Thirdly, I think the question before the American people is, as they look at this country and as they look at the world around them, the goals are the same for all Americans: the means are a question. The means are at issue. If you feel that everything that is being done now is satisfactory, that the relative power and prestige and strength of the United States is increasing in relation to that of the Communists, that we are gaining more security, that we are achieving everything as a nation that we should achieve, that we are achieving a better life for our citizens and greater strength, then I agree, I think you should vote for Mr. Nixon. But if you feel that we have to move again in the 60's, that the function of the President is to set before the people the unfinished business of our society as Franklin Roosevelt did in the 30's, the agenda for our people, what we must do as a society to meet our needs in this country and protect our security and help the cause of freedom -- as I said at the beginning -- the question before us all, that faces all Republicans and Democrats is: can freedom in the next generation conquer, or are the Communists going to be successful.

That is the great issue; and if we meet our responsibilities I think freedom will conquer. If we fail, if we fail to move ahead, if we fail to develop sufficient military and economic and social strength here in this country, then I think that the tide could begin to run against us and I don't want historians ten years from now to say these were the years when the tide ran out for the United States. I want them to say these were the years when the tide came in. These were the years when the United States started to move again.

That is the question before the American people and only you can decide what you want, what you want this country to be, what you want to do with the future. I think we are ready to move and it is to that great task, if we are successful, that we will address ourselves.

SMITH: Thank you very much, gentlemen. This hour has gone by all too quickly. Thank you very much for permitting us to present the next President of the United States on this unique program. I have been asked by the candidates to thank the American networks and the affiliated stations for providing time and facilities for this joint appearance. Other debates in this series will be announced later, and will be on different subjects. This is Howard K. Smith. Goodnight from Chicago.

## Political Brief

### CONN. COUNTY GOVERNMENT ENDS

Connecticut Oct. 1 abolished counties as a unit of government with all former county functions and powers given to various state agencies. Most county employees and officials will now come under state jurisdiction. Counties will remain as geographical areas and will serve as boundaries for the operation of courts, states attorneys and coroners. The change is the result of action by the 1959 session of the state legislature. Democrats, who had long advocated the move, were able to enact the change after the landslide victories in 1958 brought them into control of the legislature for the first time in 83 years.





# The Week In Congress

**Conservative Coalition** The "conservative coalition" of Southern Democrats and Republicans continued to be a potent influence in Senate and House voting during the 1960 session, according to Congressional Quarterly's study of all roll-call votes cast this year. The coalition appeared on 22 percent of the 300 roll calls in both chambers during the year and won on 58 percent of those votes. CQ's story gives each Member's coalition support and opposition scores for 1959 and 1960 and shows the major issues -- most of them welfare -- on which the coalition was at work. (Page 1625)

## Presidential Race

With five weeks to go, the Presidential race encompassed a number of new occurrences and "issues": The candidates engaged in their first nationally broadcast debate; Congressional Quarterly carries the complete text.... Price, style and Americanism of the potential first ladies' clothes became an issue.... Two Southern holdouts mildly endorsed Kennedy.... An Editor and Publisher poll showed that the majority of papers with a choice choose Nixon.... Nixon was accused of supporting a big western "land grab" and a top Johnson campaign advisor was sued for alleged tax fraud. (Page 1645)

## New Candidates

Some new figures appeared on the political scene last week. Forty-one-year-old Claiborne deB. Pell won the Democratic Senatorial nomination in the Rhode Island primary, taking 61 percent of the vote over two veteran politicians and ex-Governors: Dennis J. Roberts and J. Howard McGrath. Missouri parties named their candidates for the special election to replace the late Sen. Thomas C. Hennings (D). Republicans named Lon Hocker of St. Louis and Democrats picked Lt. Gov. Edward V. Long who was promptly appointed Senator until the Nov. 8 election. (Page 1646)

## Civil Defense

A House Committee has issued a report strongly rebuking the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization for the way it is handling the Nation's civil defense program. The Government Operations Committee called the program "rudimentary, decentralized, uneven, often irrelevant" and particularly criticized its failure to develop effective fallout shelter protection. Only through adequate shelter protection, the report said, could the Nation prepare for proper recovery in the event of a nuclear attack. A CQ Fact Sheet discusses the report and the background of the Nation's civil defense program. (Page 1643)

## Lobby Roundup

How did the big Washington lobbies fare in 1960? Many of the best-known pressure groups have classified the 1960 Congressional session as one they would like to forget. Among those subscribing to this view are the AFL-CIO, Teamsters Union and the Americans for Democratic Action. But the session was viewed as a success by several business groups seeking to block legislation these groups were pushing. A CQ Fact Sheet tells how 34 of the leading lobby groups made out in 1960 and what they will be seeking in 1961. (Page 1637)

## UN Debate

The UN General Assembly continued to debate international tensions in an atmosphere that was itself tense. Soviet Premier Khrushchev demanded revisions in the UN setup and the ousting of Secretary-General Hammarskjold; Cuban Premier Castro said the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay might be closed; a speech by British Prime Minister Macmillan, calling for calmness, was interrupted by Khrushchev's heckling. President Eisenhower continued his meetings with world leaders, gave full support to Hammarskjold's policies. (Page 1634)

## Around the Capitol

The Governors of 16 Southern states ended their three-day conference in Hot Springs, Ark. with a call for import quotas on textile products, apparel, menhaden fish and shrimp. The appeal was a reversal of the anti-protectionist stand taken in 1959...the Agriculture Department gave conditional authorization to the importation of 321,857 tons of Dominican Republic sugar at a two-cent per pound entry fee.... Treasury Secretary Robert B. Anderson and financier Bernard Baruch disagreed about the health of the nation's economy.... (Page 1635)



